FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-096
Thursday
20 May 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-096 CONTENTS *20 May 1993*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Chemical Weapons Disarmament Conference Opens *[Moscow TV]* 1
  - Details of Proceedings *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
  - Funds Needed To Destroy Arms *[Moscow TV]* 1
  - Yeltsin Appeals for World Support *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 1
- Lithuania Urges Latvian Induction Into Council of Europe *[BNS]* 2
- United States Cuts Grain Exports To Former USSR *[ITAR-TASS]* 2

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

- Grachev Reaches Agreement With Lithuania on Troop Withdrawal 3
  - Troops To Pull Out By 31 Aug *[BNS]* 3
  - Political Agreement Not Yet Signed *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
  - Details of Agreement Noted *[Radio Rossii]* 4
  - Terms Policy as Nonaggressive *[Vilnius Radio]* 4
- Estonia's Rebas Clarifies Reports on Troop Withdrawal Talks *[Tallinn Radio]* 4
- Shaposhnikov Discusses Aligning Military Legislation *[Moscow Radio]* 5
- CIS Collective Air Defense System Urged *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 6
- CIS Commercial Banks Set Up High Speed Clearing Center *[Moscow TV]* 7
- ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 19 May Moscow Evening Papers 8
  - Press Review for 20 May 8

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Kozyrev, Italy's Ciampi Discuss Yugoslavia, Relations *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
  - Briefed on Mostar Accord *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
  - Comments on Results of Talks *[Russian TV]* 10
  - Details Progress of Peace Process *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
  - 'Let Down' by Clinton Doubts on Bosnia *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 11
  - Arrives in Washington *[ITAR-TASS]* 11
- Rutskoy Comments on Using Force in Yugoslavia *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 11
- 'Waning' U.S. Interest in Bosnia Seen *[PRAVDA 20 May]* 12
- Russia Seen 'Seizing Initiative' on Bosnia, Vance-Owen *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 12
- West Ignores Serb Objections to Vance-Owen Plan *[PRAVDA 19 May]* 13
- Churkin Holds Talks in Vatican on Bosnia *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
- Shumeyko Upbeat About U.S. Talks, Administration *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
- U.S. Lack of Unanimity on Nuclear Test Moratorium Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 May]* 15
  - Commentary on Resuming Nuclear Testing *[Moscow International]* 15
- Chernomyrdin Postpones Visit to Ukraine *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
- Final Stage of Brigade Withdrawal in Cuba Continues *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
- DPRK Retaliates for Demands for Nonproliferation Compliance *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 16
- Sources Cited on Japan Document 'Leak' *[IZVESTIYA 19 May]* 16
- Ministry Asks Azerbaijan To Spare Condemned Men *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 17
- Greenpeace Protests at Atomic Energy Ministry *[ITAR-TASS]* 18
  - Three Activists Detained *[Moscow TV]* 18
- Commentator Deplores Russia's Loss of Influence in Mideast *[Moscow Radio]* 18
- Khasbulatov, RSA Envoy Note Shared Reform Principles *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 19
- Council of Europe Officials on Ties With Russia *[IZVESTIYA 19 May]* 19
- Deputy Premier Fedorov Comments on IMF *[Moscow TV]* 20
- Shokhin Briefs Press on IMF, EC *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 20

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

- Yeltsin Meets With Regional Administration Leaders *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
  - Leaders Pledge Support *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
- Chernomyrdin, Others Speak at 'Anticrime' Commission *[Moscow Radio]* 22
  - Commission Stresses Fighting Crime *[Russian TV]* 22
  - Yeltsin Addresses Commission *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
- Paper Carries Correction to Constitution Draft *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 23
- Yeltsin To Sign Constitutional Conference Decree *[Russian TV]* 23
- Khasbulatov Calls For Legal Adoption of Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
- Rutskoy Stresses Search for 'National Concord' *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
- Khizha Under Investigation for Arms Smuggling *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
- Sobchak, Yavlinskiy, Volskiy To Set Up New Party *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 24
- Parties, Unions Urge Yeltsin To Hold Constituent Assembly *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 24
- PRAVDA Denies Referendum Results Give Yeltsin Mandate *[19 May]* 25
- Constitutional 'Battle' 'Endangering' Russian Unity *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 May]* 25
- New Constitution Has 'Minefield' To Cross *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 26
- Democrats Divided Over Procedures To Adopt Constitution *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 28
- Observer Comments on 'Constitutional Crisis' *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
- Paper Previews 5 Jun Constitutional Conference *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 May]* 29
- New Border Law Welcomed; Concerns Expressed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 May]* 30
- Popov Fears 'Complacency' Toward Hardliners *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* 31

Economic Issues

- Further on Industrialist, Government Conference *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 33
- Fedorov Comments on Finance Ministry Reform Course *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 34
- Central Bank Chairman on Inflation Control Measures *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 34
- Government Dilemma on Budget Deficit Viewed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 18 May]* 35
- Slowing of Overall Food Price Rises Registered *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 May]* 36
- Concerns Voiced on 'Superministry's' Role *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 36

Military Issues

- More on Grachev on Army Reform, Constitution *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 May]* 37
- Supervision of Nuclear Shipment, Destruction Questioned *[Russian TV]* 38
- Council for Defense, Foreign Policy Profiled *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 39
- Commander Stresses Need for Contract Service *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 May]* 39
- Constraints, Ineffective Programs Hamper Troop Transitions *[Russian TV]* 39
- 'Problems' of Resettling Returning Troops Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 40

Supreme Soviet

- Ryabov Chooses 'All-Out Conflict' With Khasbulatov *[Moscow Radio]* 40
  - Hope From 'Forces of Reason' *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 40
- Proceedings of 20 May Session Reported 41
  - Law on Weapons Adopted *[ITAR-TASS]* 41
  - Report on Privatization *[ITAR-TASS]* 41
  - Proposals on Draft Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
- IZVESTIYA Reports 14 May Deliberations *[15 May]* 42
- Khasbulatov's Press Secretary on Draft Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
- Khasbulatov Talks With Local Officials on Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
- Supreme Soviet Requests Ruling From Constitutional Court *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
- Economic Reform Commission Chairman Elected *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
- Paper Notes Former Affiliations of Media Aides *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 44
- Supreme Soviet Asks Azerbaijan for Extradition *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 44

Regional Affairs

Chubays Visits Komi, Says Yeltsin Not To Dissolve Congress *[Moscow TV]* 45
Irkutsk Meeting Approves Yeltsin's Draft Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 45
Tatarstan To Participate in Drafting Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 45
Yarov Visits Ufa To Discuss Constitution *[Moscow TV]* 46
Lobov Visits Cheboksary To Discuss Draft Constitution *[Radio Rossii]* 46
Shakhray Checks on Draft Constitution Work in Far East *[Khabarovsk Radio]* 46
Sobchak Urges Constituent Assembly To Adopt Constitution *[Moscow TV]* 46
    Comments on Russian Presidency *[ITAR-TASS]* 46
Regions View Moscow's Actions on Constitution *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 47
PRAVDA Cites Regional Hostility to Yeltsin Draft *[18 May]* 48
Report Finds Tuva Leaning Toward Independence *[SEGODNYA 18 May]* 48
'Differences of Approach' Lead to Khabarovsk Resignations *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 14 May]* 49
Ingush Congress Adopts Declaration on State Sovereignty *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Congress Appeals to Chechens To Resolve Crisis Peacefully *[ITAR-TASS]* 49
Ural Leaders Propose Return to 'Guberniyas' *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 19 May]* 49
Soskovets To Talk With Urals Industry Chiefs *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 18 May]* 50
    Resists Pleas for 'State Regulation' *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 May]* 51
Group Sells Su-27's To Buy Color TV Production Line *[Radio Rossii]* 51
Arkhangelsk To Close Nuclear Submarine Town of Severodvinsk *[Russian TV]* 51

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk, Yeltsin To Discuss Black Sea Fleet in Jun *[UNIAR]* 52
Morozov Confirms 'Immutability' of Stance on Black Sea Fleet *[PRAVDA 19 May]* 52
Russian Commander on Black Sea Fleet's 'Dominant Position' *[ITAR-TASS]* 52
Officials Refute OBSERVER Information on Arms Sales to Iran *[DEMOKRATYCHNA UKRAYINA 18 May]* 52
Yugoslav Mediators Owen, Stoltenberg To Arrive in Kiev *[AFP]* 53
Government Denounces Bosnian Serb Referendum *[Kiev International]* 53
Foreign Ministry Protests Delays to Danube Shipping by Romania *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
Greek-U.S. Inspectors To Monitor Compliance With Treaty *[Kiev International]* 54

National Affairs

Kuchma Asks To Resign at 20 May Parliament Session *[Kiev International]* 54
    18 May Address on Economy *[Kiev International]* 55

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Shushkevich Addresses Supreme Soviet 19 May *[Minsk Radio]* 63

CENTRAL ASIA

Tajikistan

Russian Forces To Help Clear Border Town of 'Militants' *[ITAR-TASS]* 65
Prime Minister Views Flood Damage, Border Situation *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 65
UN Special Envoy Visits, Discusses Refugee Problem *[ITAR-TASS]* 65

Turkmenistan

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev Visits, Talks With Niyazov *[Moscow Radio]* 66

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Top Georgian Leaders Arrive To Sign Friendship Accord *[Tbilisi Radio]* 67
    Friendship Treaty Signed *[Moscow Radio]* 67
    Shevardnadze Suggests Caucasian Peacemaking Mission *[Russian TV]* 67
Russia To Ensure Gas Supplies *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 May]* 68
Government To Respond to Peace Plan 26 May *[ITAR-TASS]* 68
Students Demonstrate Against Turkey *[Moscow Radio]* 68

Azerbaijan

Baku Reportedly Not To Join CIS Economic Zone *[TURAN]* 68
Agreement Between Nakhichevan, Armenia Called 'Betrayal' *[ASSA-IRADA]* 69
Nagorno-Karabakh Opposed to Turkey as Mediator *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Kulizade Welcomes Schedule for Ending Conflict *[Baku TV]* 69
Cooperation Agreement Signed With Russia *[Baku Radio]* 69
Guseynov, Iranian Ambassador Discuss Cooperation *[Tehran Radio]* 69
Kamberov Rejects Holding Special Supreme Soviet Session *[TURAN]* 69
Elchibey Congratulates National Assembly on Anniversary *[Baku Radio]* 70

Georgia

Government Orders Troops To Cease Fire 20 May *[ITAR-TASS]* 70
    Abkhazian Leader Orders Troops To Cease Fire *[Moscow TV]* 70
    Both Sides Observing Cease-Fire *[ITAR-TASS]* 71
    Shevardnadze Statement on Cease-Fire *[ITAR-TASS]* 71
Yeltsin Representatives Meet With Abkhaz Officials *[ITAR-TASS]* 71
Defense Minister Sets Up 1st Army Corps *[Moscow Radio]* 72
Shevardnadze Meets With Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister *[Tbilisi Radio]* 72

Chemical Weapons Disarmament Conference Opens

PM1905144593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1000 GMT 17 May 93

[By A. Peslyak; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Peslyak] In Moscow, military and civilian chemists and medical personnel have been discussing how to tackle chemical disarmament, how to eliminate unjustified fears among the population, how to raise the public's confidence in them through collaboration, and how to avoid wasting the wealth of experience they have gained in measuring and monitoring the chemical arsenal which in the past was being developed, but is now being destroyed.

But, strange as it may seem, civilian chemicals have frequently proved to be more damaging than military chemicals.

[P. Shkodin, director of the Hygiene, Toxicology, and Occupational Pathology Scientific Research Institute] When toxic substances are produced for economic purposes, the risk of acute toxic poisoning is higher than it is in the case of the production of military toxins, and I would reaffirm that we have not recorded any cases of the environmental discharge of military toxins in any of the classes of compounds being produced.

[Peslyak] So there has not been any drama or accident involving chemical weapons. But, the contagion must be eliminated. On the basis of law. Russia does not have such a law at the moment, whereas the United States has five such laws. And this must be monitored in various ways—both at national and international level.

Details of Proceedings

LD1905122993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1155 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—A comprehensive programme for a stage-by-stage elimination of chemical weapons in Russia is one of central subjects of discussion at the first international chemical disarmament conference that opened here on Wednesday [19 May]. It is being attended by more than 100 foreign scientists, political and public figures, diplomats, representatives of business and industrial communities.

Recommendations which will be worked out during discussion will help Russia implement its comprehensive programme for the elimination of chemical weapons, a spokesman at the chemical and biological conversion committee under the president of Russia told ITAR-TASS.

The Russian federation is known to have signed a convention banning the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons in Paris on January 13, this year. In keeping with its obligations, the Russian side is to eliminate 45 per cent of the stockpiles of toxic agents by the year 2004 during the first phase of chemical disarmament.

Various problems concerning the elimination of toxic agents, the conversion of military chemical production plants, and procedures for the monitoring and inspection of compliance with the convention are also to be considered at the three-day conference.

Funds Needed To Destroy Arms

LD1905123793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 19 May 93

[By Mikhail Aleksandridi and Yuriy Kovalenko; from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] Representatives of more than 20 countries who have gathered in Moscow to attend the International Conference on Chemical Disarmament will take three days to discuss various aspects of this problem. It is an acute problem for Russia, not only because 40,000 tonnes of poisonous substances are on its territory, but also because more than one half of all disarmament expenditure will be required to destroy chemical weapons. This is noted in a message of greeting sent by Boris Yeltsin to the participants in the Conference. It is Yeltsin's view that the implementation of the tasks provided for in the Paris convention banning chemical weapons is possible only under close and open international cooperation. Only such cooperation is capable of stopping the vicious circle of mankind stockpiling arsenals with which to kill itself. The Moscow Conference is an attempt to provide an answer to the question of how this is to be done.

Yeltsin Appeals for World Support

PM1905150393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Unattributed report on Yeltsin message to Moscow International Conference On Chemical Disarmament: "Moscow Forum for the Destruction of Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] The first Moscow International Conference on Chemical Disarmament started work in Moscow today. It will examine political, scientific-technical, socioeconomic, and legal questions pertaining to the destruction of chemical weapons, conversion of military-chemical production, and procedures for monitoring and inspecting the observance of the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

The conference will be attended by more than 100 foreign political and public diplomats and military experts and also by representatives of leading Western firms.

Russian Federation President B.N. Yeltsin has sent the following greetings to the conference participants and guests:

Esteemed Conference Participants and Guests!

I cordially welcome you, eminent politicians and public figures, scientists, diplomats, representatives of business circles, and military experts from many countries of the world, to Moscow this spring and the first International Conference on Chemical Disarmament.

The beginning of this year was marked by an important international event of great historical significance. As you know, a global convention on the prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction was signed in Paris on 13 January 1993. Russia chose to sign the convention. So far 142 countries have subscribed to this unique political document in the disarmament sphere. So the first real step has been taken on the path to a noble goal—ridding mankind of the threat of one of the most perfidious types of weapons of mass destruction.

The next step in this sphere will be the unconditional implementation of the convention by the states that are party to this international accord. It is a difficult task for Russia. Its solution will require a considerable material outlay—to be precise, more than one-half of the expenditure on all types of disarmament and the mobilization of all Russia's intellectual and spiritual powers. We also hope to secure the maximum support world community countries committed to the destruction of chemical arsenals.

In the solution of such a complex and multifaceted task, guaranteeing the safety of human beings and protecting the environment will be the main priorities.

The way to do this is to ensure close and open cooperation and a joint quest for the wisest scientific-technical, ecological, and organizational solutions leading to the effective implementation of the provisions of the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

I express profound confidence that the first Moscow International Conference on Questions of Chemical Disarmament will find a productive amalgam of the existing approaches to this problem and confirm the world community's resolve to save mankind from chemical weapons.

There is no other way.

I wish you success in your work.

Lithuania Urges Latvian Induction Into Council of Europe

WS2005115493 Tallinn BNS in English 1504 GMT 18 May 93

[Text] Vilnius, May 18, BNS—Latvia should follow its Baltic sisters into the CE [Council of Europe] this fall, says Aloyzas Sakalas, the head of the Lithuania's CE delegation. But, he said, Russia's acceptance may take a little time.

Fresh from his own country's acceptance in the international organization, Sakalas said Monday that there should not be any serious problems with Latvia's admittance into the Council of Europe.

Lithuania and Estonia were granted full membership into the Council last week.

"Much has changed since Estonia was accepted," he said. "The councils and committees of the European Council have recognized that minority rights in Latvia and Estonia are better observed (there) than in some European states."

Sakalas said that a letter by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, which reprimanded Estonia, did have an effect during the voting—opposite to the one Russian diplomats hoped for.

He also said he assumed Russia's admission will take a long time. The Baltic states delegations have agreed to put forth the unconditioned withdrawal of Russian troops from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia as a major condition for letting Russia into the Council, he said.

United States Cuts Grain Exports To Former USSR

LD1905164593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1420 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Loschilin]

[Text] Washington May 19 TASS—Exports of U.S. farm produce to republics of the former Soviet Union will be reduced by 30 per cent, that is from 2.7 to 1.9 billion dollars, during the current year in comparison with 1992, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced on Tuesday [18 May].

According to the department's economists, the reason for this cut in exports is based on two main factors: Stopping of credit guarantees for food stuff purchases by the American Government and a planned general reduction in import volumes by newly independent states which is dictated by their unfavourable financial conditions.

Previously guaranteed and free of charge supplies constituted the bulk of American agricultural exports to the region. But in November 1992 when Russia began delaying repayment of credits for American grain purchases, Washington discontinued such subsidies to Russia. At present the total credits, on which payment is held up by Moscow, exceeds 850 million dollars.

Grachev Reaches Agreement With Lithuania on Troop Withdrawal

Troops To Pull Out By 31 Aug

WS2005120193 Tallinn BNS in English 0710 GMT 20 May 93

[Text] Vilnius, May 19, BNS—The schedule of the Russian army withdrawal from Lithuania will be observed and troops will pull out before Aug. 31, the Lithuanian and Russian defense ministers announced at a joint press conference in Vilnius Wednesday.

Russian defense minister Pavel Grachev said that the withdrawal schedule, signed in Moscow Sept. 8, was carefully discussed during his visit in Lithuania. 18 military issues were discussed all in all. He said "we did not touch upon the political problems of the main agreement - the status, the presence and the withdrawal of Russian troops. They must be solved on presidential level."

Grachev said the problem of handing over military installations of the Russian army has been settled. The Russian troops will hand over all military installations on Lithuanian territory in accordance with the acts drawn up. The acts will then be submitted to government commissions which will determine the prices and mutual settlements.

Russia also agreed to sell and to hand over some of its weapons, munitions and military equipment. Russia would sell this from its arsenals in Lithuania. However, due to the fact that Russia's defense institutions are not allowed to sell arms, both ministers worked out a draft resolution of the Russian prime minister to allow the trade. Grachev said he hopes that the Russian premier will sign the resolution in the near future.

Both ministers discussed the possibility to create two military joint-ventures - a tank-repair factory and a helicopter-repair factory, both in Kaunas. A final decision will be made on governmental level.

The ministers held a separate discussion on the withdrawal of some artillery depots and equipment of navy units. Grachev said Russia will probably be unable to pull out such great amounts of ammunition before Aug. 31 due to shortage of railroad cars. The ministers agreed that several Russian soldiers would remain at the depots for loading work in such case. The depots would be guarded by Lithuanian armed forces.

An agreement was reached on the sequence of handing over military airports. An airport in Siauliai is undergoing such procedures already. An airport in Panevezys will be handed over before July 1. One more airport in Kazlu Ruda will be handed over before Aug. 31. The ministers also agreed that the navigation equipment of the airport in Siauliai will be sold to Lithuania.

Agreements were also reached that Russia will hand over several tons of explosives to liquidate artillery shells and mines which remain on military training grounds. The hand over of fuel reservoirs and ammunition depots was discussed, as well.

The ministers reached an agreement on the exchange of military attaches.

Grachev said that Russia welcomes Lithuania's willingness to assist the building of apartments for the Russian servicemen in the Kaliningrad region. Lithuanian builders will participate if financing is received from western countries.

An agreement was reached that Lithuania would get back its training airplanes, as well as training and hunting rifles, confiscated by the Soviet troops during the January 1991 events.

Both ministers signed a protocol on the agreements reached.

Grachev said Russia's military doctrine does not include a separate paragraph, saying that Russia would defend its citizens in other countries.

He said the doctrine is purely defensive. Russia will have 1.5 million men in its armed forces by 1995. The army of the former Soviet Union had around 4.5 million soldiers.

Grachev said that the Baltics are not threatened as an attack objective or as an aggressor. "The defense of interests of the Russian speaking population in other states is a political problem and it is with the competence of the Foreign Ministry."

Grachev said that Audrius Butkevicius, Lithuania's defense minister, presented a list of weapons and equipment that Lithuania is willing to buy from Russia. This issue as well as the issue of settlements will be discussed on governmental level. "Like to all other states - this will be sold for world market prices."

The Russian minister said that a dialog with Estonia and Latvia is still impossible. Grachev said they "categorically demand an immediate troop withdrawal before legal documents are ready." He said that the suspension of the pull out from Latvia and Estonia will continue until state leaders conclude a general accord and until a withdrawal schedule is worked out.

Grachev said there is a possibility that the main political agreement on troop withdrawal from Lithuania may be signed after Aug. 31. He said the document was not signed in Moscow last September because "somebody made certain corrections at the last moment due to unknown reasons." The Russian minister said these corrections were of categorical nature, however he did not specify which side had made them.

Butkevicius said the political agreement should be signed before Aug. 31 "in a form acceptable to both states." He said Grachev contributed greatly to the organization of a speedy withdrawal of Russian troops from Lithuania and found solutions to a number of technical problems.

Political Agreement Not Yet Signed

LD1905160893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1500 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Vladas Burbulis and Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Vilnius May 19 TASS—"Russia has never viewed the Baltic states as objects of its possible attack," Russian Defence Minister Army General Pavel Grachev, currently here on an official visit, told a news conference of the Russian and Lithuanian defence ministers here today.

He said they "have agreed with the Lithuanian military heads to consolidate bilateral relations, continue dialogues and practical steps".

The minister expressed satisfaction with results of his negotiation with Lithuanian Defence Minister Audrius Butkevicius and noted "practically all military-technical aspects of Russian troops withdrawal have been settled. In the next few days we will sign a joint protocol, currently worked out by experts".

The Russian troops will leave republican territory before September 1, 1993, as it is envisaged by the Russian-Lithuanian protocol of September 8, 1992.

In his turn, the Lithuanian defence minister said he is satisfied with negotiations results. "As for a political agreement on Russian troops withdrawal - the chief legal document to be signed by the two countries' presidents - the issue is being solved by the Lithuanian and Russian state delegations currently in Vilnius," said Butkevicius.

Tonight the Russian defence minister will leave for Russia.

Details of Agreement Noted

LD1905211393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev has finished his visit to Lithuania. Oleg Kordyukov gives the details:

[Kordyukov] General Grachev met today with head of the Lithuanian parliament, Ceslovas Jursenas, and members of the parliamentary National Security Committee. The Russian defense minister reassured the Lithuanian leadership that the withdrawal of troops by the end of this summer is a matter of honor for the Russian side.

The schedule for the troop withdrawal and the procedure for handing over military installations and equipment were finalized during his talks with Audrius Butkevicius, head of Lithuania's Defense Department. The ministers agreed that the exact value of each military installation being left in Lithuania by Russia will be determined, and that the governments of the two countries will agree on terms of payment.

The Lithuanian Ministry for National Defense intends to purchase weapons from Russian arsenals on Lithuanian territory. Pavel Grachev agreed to this, pointing out that the conditions for weapons sales to Lithuania will be the same as for other countries—that is, at world prices.

The ministers also agreed that Lithuanian youths will be given the chance to complete studies in Russian military schools, while in the future the Lithuanian Defense Department will be able to send students to Ryazan airborne assault and Kaliningrad naval schools. Both sides said they would like to exchange military attaches.

Terms Policy as Nonaggressive

LD1905173293 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] The Russian Defense Ministry delegation is concluding its visit to Lithuania today. The delegation, led by the Army General Pavel Grachev, met with Seimas Chairman Ceslovas Jursenas; Gediminas Kirkilas, chairman of the Seimas National Security Committee; and others in the Seimas building today.

The meeting passed in a friendly and cordial atmosphere. The Russian defense minister reported on the work carried out by his delegation and the leadership of the Lithuania Ministry of National Defense. He described the new Russian military doctrine as being by no means aggressive. In accordance with this doctrine, the Russian Army is to be reduced to one-fourth its current size. Pavel Grachev expressed his wish that construction organizations building apartments for servicemen in Russia should be exempt from taxes or that their taxes be reduced.

Pavel Grachev and [National Defense Minister] Audrius Butkevicius also gave a news conference today.

Estonia's Rebas Clarifies Reports on Troop Withdrawal Talks

LD2005104793 Tallinn Radio Tallinn in Estonian 1400 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Today's hot news is the report by both TASS and REUTER about yesterday's meeting of the Baltic defense ministers with Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev in Vilnius. At the meeting Defense Minister Hain Rebas is said to have apologized for having called the Russian troops occupation troops and to have agreed, in essence, to paying compensation for Russian Army installations. We asked Hain Rebas himself to comment.

[Begin recording] [Rebas] Yesterday's meeting in Vilnius with Defense Minister Grachev took place at the level of delegations. On our side Colonel Laaneots and Tonu Miller, head of the Foreign Ministry's security-policy department, came along. Mr. Grachev had four or five generals with him, each better looking than the last, plus an important civilian, and four or five journalists who stood behind Grachev all the time and took notes and recorded on tape exactly what was being said. It was in fact a show, in a way, demonstrating that he wanted to dictate to us [word indistinct] and demonstrate what a powerful man he is. Or something like that.

The discussion started with me apologizing for my speech in Brussels, in case Mr. Grachev had felt personally offended by my speech—because this would have been of course my [word indistinct] way to insult him personally. He then started to talk about occupation forces in Estonia and gave a lecture on history to the effect that there is no talk of any kind about occupation forces [illegible] the Russian troops are temporarily deployed on the territory of the Republic of Estonia on the basis of an agreement between the two countries.

And when he went on I took the floor and stated kindly and politely: Mr. Grachev, I am a historian. I am a professional historian and have been a professor at [word indistinct] University for 12 years, and I think that there is no point in you continuing on this subject. In any case, (?their side's) view was that if we continue to talk about occupation forces then nothing will come of our talks and [word indistinct] delegation would have to leave, and immediately. So he presented an ultimatum in a sense. I then made a polite [word indistinct] to him: Mr. Grachev, we obviously do not have much to say to each other on the subject of history. Why do we not continue in a constructive spirit? And this is what we did. So that, naturally, our side in no way determined the status of the Russian troops [passage indistinct]—there can be no talk of this. This means Grachev spoke as a (?mouthpiece) of Stalinist history.

The net result was that on both sides we will endeavor to interest our heads of state in a meeting so that a kind of basic agreement can be formulated at the top level. And we also agreed to ask the heads of state to order the defense ministers to determine the details and agree between them.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Russian TASS report also talks about payment of compensation to the Russian Army.

[Rebas, laughs] There was no talk about compensation. There was talk, as I already said, that we have come here to meet you, Mr. Grachev, because your troops must leave Estonia as agreed internationally—and we want to be of assistance to you. I, as the Estonian defense minister, have spoken in public on several occasions and said that it is not my task to pick a fight with the Russian troops here but to help them to go [word indistinct] as politely as possible. And we came precisely in this spirit. There was no talk of compensation. There was talk, finally, about us offering him a [word indistinct] option that I have been preparing here at the Defense Ministry for quite some time already. It is a concrete building [word indistinct] far away—not in Pskov Oblast or behind Novgorod, but further away—where housing would be built for Russian officers' families. We have (?state-owned firms) and international capital involved—as is known, Norwegian, Danish, and U.S. funds for the time being, and perhaps funds from some other countries, too. That is, we are willing to build the housing with Estonian labor and with international financial support. There was not a word about compensation.

Shaposhnikov Discusses Aligning Military Legislation

LD1905164893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1100 GMT 19 May 93

[From the "Armed Forces and Society" program]

[Text] [Announcer Morozov] There was an extraordinary meeting of CIS heads of state and government in Moscow on 14 May. The main issue at the meeting was the further rapprochement of Commonwealth states. Something like 25 documents were prepared for consideration. The majority of these will be adopted at the heads of state meeting to be held in Yerevan on 16 July. A number of the documents are devoted to issues of collective security for the CIS states.

Air Marshal Yevgeniy Ivanovich Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, talked about these at a news conference. Having described the meeting as one of mutual understanding, frankness, constructiveness, and hope, Marshal Shaposhnikov replied to questions from journalists. My question was this: Yevgeniy Ivanovich, as I understand it, one of the fundamental conditions for mutual understanding is alignment of the military legislation in Commonwealth countries.

[Begin recording] [Shaposhnikov] You have rightly noted this, thank you for reminding me that we have been in a hurry in some ways. It is a matter once again for the states to pass certain laws which are needed at the present time, or to review, improve, or make certain amendments to them so that they do not impede collective security, or the aspiration for it, to put it crudely. In connection with this, we have submitted both in the Russian parliament and the parliaments of other states alternative versions, so to speak, on those issues that may run counter to the establishment of a collective security system. At the interparliamentary assembly, which will take place in St. Petersburg on 23-24 May, we are also tabling these issues for the heads of the parliaments. We will suggest, or even spell out in a well-substantiated and clear-cut way, the methods for getting rid of these discrepancies so that our servicemen are not divided in the future Joint Armed Forces or the future collective security system by their own legislation. Thus, for instance, Russian servicemen doing their service on the territory of Kazakhstan do not feel themselves to be worse off than those doing their service on Russian territory, and so on.

[Morozov] What about the working group?

[Shaposhnikov] There is a working group. It was appointed under the inter-parliamentary assembly and it is presently working on the documents; we will be discussing this at the next meeting. [end recording]

[Morozov] Esteemed listeners, we will tell you about the outcome of this work.

CIS Collective Air Defense System Urged

PM1905145193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 93 p 3

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor Colonel General Yuriy Votintsev under "Disarming, But Sensibly" rubric: "Without a Shield Spells Defeat. On the Fate of the Air Defense Forces"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The Union's disintegration has enabled the United States to abandon its ruinous "star wars" program, which destabilizes peace. We have paid too high a price for this. It seems that our rulers are prepared to create new incentives for Washington to economize on the military budget. The article offered for your attention shows the disastrous situation in which our Air Defense Forces [PVO] and the entire system designed to warn of a missile attack have ended up.

PRAVDA has learned that one of the next few sessions of the Russian Federation Security Council, which was recently subjected to a "purge," will be devoted to this topic. What can Russia expect from it?

Anxiety over the fate of my own branch of the Armed Forces—Air Defense—does not leave me for a single day. We are talking about troops in a state of constant combat readiness, performing around-the-clock combat duty guarding the country and defending it against attack from the air and from space. This task of state importance used to be fulfilled on the territory of all the republics of the former Soviet Union. But the present rulers of the majority of them have now taken the path of reforming PVO units and large units.

Most likely, another "reform" is coming for the PVO. How many reforms—as inevitable as ill fate, with irreplaceable losses—have already been experienced!

From 1932 through the present day, 11 military leaders have been appointed PVO commanders in chief. Every one of them has been tested by reforms. Although there has only been one Rust [W. German citizen who landed a light plane on Red Square] in the history of the forces, seven commanders in chief have been removed from their post....

Looking back from today's position, you cannot help wondering: When they adopted the Belovezhskaya Forest decision on the breakup of a unified great power—the Soviet Union—did B. Yeltsin, L. Kravchuk, and S. Shushkevich and their ideologues (G. Burbulis, S. Shakhray, and others) think about what would happen to the Armed Forces when they were divided up among 15 independent states?

The most perfidious and hardest blow was undoubtedly struck against the PVO. It led to the collapse of the unified system. Thus, in the northwestern, southwestern, western, and partly in the southern aerospace salients, the potential for detecting aircraft was reduced by 400-1,000 km. The flight time to Russia's new border was reduced by 15-40 minutes for supersonic aircraft.

The radiotechnical and antiaircraft missile units and fighter aircraft regiments which have escaped being seized and privatized are being withdrawn to Russian territory. Some of them are being disbanded. Others are being fitted out anew. This work is still continuing, but 26,000 officers and ensigns with families have already ended up in the position of refugees without a roof over their heads. There has recently been an increase in the number of cadre servicemen and—this is most distressing—young servicemen who see no prospect in further service.

As a result of the withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces, the elimination of the Warsaw Pact, and the disunity among the CIS countries over concluding a Collective Security Treaty, Moscow PVO District together with the units and commands stationed in the North Caucasus and Kazakhstan became border districts. And yet only recently they made up the second and even the third echelon in the PVO operational structure.

The problem has arisen once again, as it did 30-40 years ago, of creating an unbroken radar field along the present border of the Russian Federation, new groupings of antiaircraft missile troops and fighter aircraft bases, and of organizing a system of combat control.

It is not hard to imagine how these problems are being resolved if you take into account the limited complement of forces, means, and material and technical resources.

Just as in the past, no reorganization of the PVO took place without increased reconnaissance by contiguous countries for the purpose of determining the possibilities of and conditions for breaching the air defenses. As a result, the number of flights by reconnaissance aircraft along the USSR's former border has increased over the past 12-18 months. In the south of Afghanistan, helicopters have encroached on Tajikistan's airspace with impunity, while Iranian aircraft have flown patrols over Dushanbe.

The radiotechnical centers for over-the-horizon locations of the missile attack warning system and the optical-electronic space control centers have ended up in a very serious condition on all the salients mentioned. They have been blocked. The status of these centers in Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, and Tajikistan has not been properly defined.

Since the mid-eighties, large-scale work was carried out to replace obsolete stations and create new ones at these centers at a total cost of something like 2.5 billion rubles [R]. Approximately R1.5 billion had been assimilated by January 1990. Funding has now stopped. Virtually no work is being done. It could happen that in the next few years the CIS will be left without the most reliable and accurate means of over-the-horizon detection of ballistic missiles on flight trajectories and of space monitoring at altitudes of up to 40,000 km.

What can be undertaken under the conditions that have taken shape?

With the creation of the missile-space defense forces within the PVO 20 years ago they became aerospace defense forces in terms of the combat tasks being tackled. This has been substantiated in a number of scientific research works. Proposals to bring the name of the branch of the Armed Forces into line with the tasks being tackled were rejected by the General Staff. The reason was the regime of secrecy in the missile-space defense forces. Although this was a secret only to the peoples of the USSR, certainly not to foreign special services. Renaming the Armed Forces branch the Aerospace Defense Forces would accord fully with their modern purpose as a reliable shield against possible strikes from the air and from space. This would raise the prestige of the aerospace defense forces and, maybe, end the temptation to reform them yet again.

In my view the CIS states—primarily Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan—could conclude a collective security treaty defining, in addition to other questions, the conditions for deployment, operational support, and combat duty organization in a unified aerospace defense system with centralized control by the commander in chief. At the same time the state control centers and the command posts of the corresponding defense ministries would receive not only information on the air situation but also information warning of a missile attack and on the space situation. Other CIS countries could subsequently subscribe to this treaty.

I believe that the CIS countries which did not adopt the treaty should sign bilateral treaties with the Russian Federation pledging to provide timely and reliable reciprocal information on the air situation. On the basis of these bilateral treaties the over-the-horizon radar centers of the missile attack warning system and the optical-electronic space control centers would remain Russian bases on agreed and clearly defined lease terms, without the right to seize them or to discriminate against service personnel.

It is customary now to maintain that we have no enemies, while amicable relations of partnership have been established with the United States and NATO. But reliable partnership relations can exist only with someone of equal strength. People use the language of diktat with a weak person and impose their own will. B. Yeltsin and A. Kozyrev frequently remind our people that the Russian Federation, as the Soviet Union's legal heir, remains a great power. Bitter though it may be to admit it, this is not so. Russia has been substantially weakened. A single great power is left in the world—the United States. It is the one now dictating its order to the world. Draw your own conclusions.

CIS Commercial Banks Set Up High Speed Clearing Center

LD1905205893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent Igor Minayev, including recorded remarks from interview with A. B. Dubilet, deputy chairman of the Dnepropetrovsk "Privatbank" board; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] An end has been put to the State Bank monopoly, and a network of commercial banks is thriving in the Commonwealth countries at present. There are thousands of them. However, this circumstance alone does not put industrialists in an optimistic mood. They cannot pay each other for raw materials and goods quickly at present. It is time money sacks were carried by air and they are—what can one do?

While leaders of the Commonwealth states are only trying to reach an agreement on setting up an international bank intended to facilitate the settlement of mutual accounts, financial experts have already gotten down to business. Recently at an interbank conference—Dnepropetrovsk's "Privatbank" was the initiator of it—a high speed clearing center was set up. More than 30 commercial banks from major industrial regions in the CIS and the Baltics have joined it.

At a regular conference Dnepropetrovsk's "Privatbank'-'—the secretariat of the center—and member banks drew up measures to speed up payments. A single electronic communications system is being created for all banks that are members of the clearing center. It is possible that in the near future it will justify its name—"high speed".

[Dubilet] We have to go a very long way before we become a normal bank. I will put it this way—normal in the real meaning of the word. There are moves in this direction, and they are far from easy.

[Minayev] The bankers have already achieved good results—the amount of the center's payments is almost a billion rubles. For example, mutual accounts between Krasnoyarsk and Dnepropetrovsk can be settled within one banking day, not within a month or a week.

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 19 May Moscow Evening Papers

LD1905202693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2016 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—Evening newspapers report today the Russian Constitutional Court has recognized a resolution of the Russian Parliament "on the IZVESTIYA newspaper" as not corresponding to a number of Russian constitutional articles.

A commentary by Yuriy Feofanov published by today's IZVESTIYA issue says the Constitutional Court resolution "On one newspaper confirmed the constitutional norm on freedom of speech and press, as well as natural and stable right of democratic society to independence of thoughts and opinion within the framework of the law".

IZVESTIYA reports the Supreme Court's Military Board has revealed gross violations of legislation on the part of the Russian procurator general and his deputy in the investigation of the coup plotters' case and says the Supreme Court, thus, did not violate the letter of law.

A commentary on the issue stressed "for the first time in a court resolution we found direct references to the Constitution, human rights, presumption of innocence and independence of the court authority". IZVESTIYA believes this "is an impressive example for Russian justice".

IZVESTIYA carries an interview with deputy head of the Russian State Property Committee Dmitriy Vasilyev on the essence of amendments to the state privatization program for 1993. The program provides for investment tenders to sell property of small, medium and large enterprises. Vasilyev did not exclude a possibility of use of German experience in free assignment of inefficient plants to investors on condition of jobs' preservation.

The unemployment level has reached one per cent of economically-active population, IZVESTIYA reports today, referring to the Russian Federal Employment Service. "Over 720,000 persons have received the unemployed status. A total of 113,000 have been employed," says the newspaper.

Information of the employment service confirms the fact the bankruptcy mechanism so far brings no results, and the credit and financial policy boosts conservation of manpower disengagement processes.

The Ukrainian prime minister asks for prolongation of extraordinary powers for another year. Reporting this fact, IZVESTIYA says Leonid Kuchma has not offered a specific plan to overcome the crisis or guarantee stabilization over this period. He is just ready to stop further crisis developments.

The newspaper said the premier told the republican parliament he will meet Russian Government head Viktor Chernomyrdin on May 20 in Kiev. This circumstance excludes Kuchma's resignation even if the Supreme Soviet does not prolong the governments' extraordinary powers.

"Kyrgyzstan is running the risk to become an eternal debtor not only in the Commonwealth, but in the whole world," says IZVESTIYA, reporting a forecast of development of Kyrgyzstan, whose economy is in crisis. In the newspaper's opinion, the republic could improve the situation with only long-term Western credits, but Kyrgyzstan is not likely to receive 400 million U.S. dollar aid, on which President Askar Akayev counts.

IZVESTIYA carries an article by Vadim Sadovskiy, ph.d., a staffer of the Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute of System Analysis. The article dwells on the mechanism of knavish extortion of money from scientists allegedly awarded the title of "International Person of the Year".

The scientists were offered to transfer 75 sterling pounds or 135 U.S. dollars to the International Biography Center in Cambridge to receive a copy of the diploma.

A resident from Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy claims she is a cousin of Russian President Boris Yeltsin, the VECHERNAYA MOSKVA newspaper reports. The woman is an activist of a local Hinduism religious community. Observers say she really resembles Boris Yeltsin.

Press Review for 20 May

LD2005063093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0505 GMT 20 May 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—By ITAR-TASS:

Today's newspapers focus on matters of home policy. They carry reports on the events of the day, information from "hot spots" on the territory of the former Soviet Union, exclusive interviews of politicians, churchmen and key economists, as well as feature articles.

Under the headline "President Puts on Full-Dress Uniform. Should Criminals be on Their Guard?" the youth daily "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA" publishes a report on yesterday's meeting of the interdepartmental commission for fighting crime, which was for the first time personally chaired by Russian President Boris Yeltsin. "The Russian president demanded more resoluteness from the Interior and Security Ministries in combating crime and corruption. The commission meeting unanimously declared for tighter measures to put a stop to criminal activities", the newspaper says.

"If not the vice-president, then a candidate for president. Aleksandr Rutskoy gets ready to take off", the "NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA" newspaper comments on the intention by the Russian vice-president to run for presidency at the next presidential elections. Proceeding from the fact that "Rutskoy's rating revealed by sociological surveys yields to only that of Yeltsin and exceeds those of all the other potential claimants for presidency taken together", the newspaper assumes that under the present conditions Rutskoy may win support of those who "although not feeling much of the vice-president's personal appeal, still view him as the only possible chance "to topple Yeltsin". [quotation marks as received] It is safe to say that Rutskoy's political activity will grow in the near future, "NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA" says.

"Now much will depend on the Abkhazian side", Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Pastukhov, presidential representative for problems of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict settlement, said in an interview with the trade-union daily "TRUD" on arrival from Gudauta. "In Gudauta we will go ahead with discussing possible ways for resolving the conflict and for the beginning will try to agree upon a ceasefire", he pointed out.

The newspaper "NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA" carries an appeal by Shaykh-ul-Islam Allakhshukyur Pasha-Zade, chairman of the supreme religious council of the Caucasian peoples, to prevent the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict from escalating into religious strife. He firmly believes the problem may be solved only by pooling efforts of the both sides, Armenian and Azeri, with the participation of all sections of the population, including religious figures, military, state leaders, diplomats.

"NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA" publishes an interview of Russian Minister for Foreign Economic Relations Sergey Glazyev, doctor of sciences (economics). He believes "there is a way out of crisis", which he sees first of all in increasing Russia's exports. Glazyev stresses the need for state regulation to keep demand and investments stable in such branches as aero-space industry, telecommunications, instrument-making and electronic industries, which have come to "financial collapse" because of many-fold decrease in demand from consumers and the state. Noting that those industries make "the basis for the present and future economic rise", the minister says there are certain "niches" for their growth on world market, "however some time is needed for our enterprises to adapt themselves for the conditions of world competition". Glazyev also points to good prospects for development in such industries as gas production and procession, pure construction materials and laser technologies.

"Soviet power is in great debt to all peoples of Russia", says Fazy Aliyeva, Daghestani poetess and a member of the World Peace Council, in an interview with the newspaper "ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA". She points out that Soviet power "deprived them (those peoples) of religion and replaced it with ideology, in which words were never matched with deeds and which bore fruit of unbelief and spiritual degradation".

The "PRAVDA" and "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA" newspapers carry reports on the current situation in Chechnya.

Kozyrev, Italy's Ciampi Discuss Yugoslavia, Relations

LD1905133293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1245 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Aleksey Golyayev and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Rome, 19 May—The working day of Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev started with a meeting with Carl Azeglio Ciampi, chairman of Italy's council of ministers. Kozyrev arrived here on 18 May as part of his consultations on settling the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. The two sides also discussed prospects for developing bilateral Russo-Italian relations.

The minister passed to the head of the Italian Government an invitation from President Boris Yeltsin to make an official visit to Russia. It is envisaged that a treaty on the principles of relations between our countries will be signed during Ciampi's visit to Moscow. Ciampi expressed hope that he will meet President Yeltsin personally during the G-7 meeting in Tokyo in July.

Andrey Kozyrev informed the Italian premier on the developments in the mission to settle the conflict in former Yugoslavia, on his contacts with leaders of different states of former Yugoslavia, and on the essence of the conception of "quelling the war in Bosnia" [tusheniye voyny v Rossiyi] put forward by President Yeltsin. The sides agreed with each other that it is necessary to continue diplomatic and political efforts to settle the conflict on the basis of the Vance-Owen plan, and emphasized the importance for the world community to preserve a uniform approach to this problem.

Briefed on Mostar Accord

LD1905142193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1300 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Aleksey Golyayev and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Rome, 19 May—There was a telephone conversation today between the Russian delegation and cochairmen of the coordinating committee of the international conference on the former Yugoslavia Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg. They briefed the head of the delegation, Russia's foreign minister Andrey Kozyrev, on the accords reached yesterday in Mostar which, in the view of the Russian side, can be viewed "as the first step in the steady implementation of the Vance-Owen plan."

Mutual satisfaction was expressed at the first round of talks on Croatian-Krajina relations which were held in Croatia yesterday on Moscow's initiative. ITAR-TASS correspondents have been told that during the meeting the sides not only agreed to seek ways of resolving economic problems, but also to hold talks in the next few days in the Croatian capital on political problems concerning relations between Zagreb and Knin. A spokesman for the Russian delegation stressed to the ITAR-TASS correspondents that "a good start has been made in this mission and it is very important that the dialogue continues in the same vein."

A report on progress in the Russian delegation's mission is on the desk of the Russian president every day. At the same time, close contacts are being maintained with all interested parties.

Comments on Results of Talks

LD1905200293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent V. Martynov, including recording of remarks by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev in interview aboard plane; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The half day which Andrey Kozyrev spent in Belgrade was taken up with meetings with the country's leadership: with Yugoslav President Cosic; with Montenegrin President Bulatovic, who came specially to Belgrade; and, finally, with Serbian President Milosevic. These meetings indicated the objective and balanced nature of Russia's policy in the region. The main purpose of our efforts is, without doubt, an end to the bloodshed. What did we succeed in doing?

[Kozyrev] The main result is that none of the people I talked to rejects the Vance-Owen plan. By that I mean the leaders of Croatia, Bosnia, and Yugoslavia. This is especially important, and President Milosevic also reaffirmed that he remains a supporter of this plan, and there is a realization among the international community and in Yugoslavia that there is, essentially, no alternative to this plan. [Video shows Kozyrev in talks with Yugoslav leaders, being interviewed aboard plane.]

Details Progress of Peace Process

LD1905215493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 2025 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Aleksey Golyayev and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Rome, 20 May—An intensive process of consultations over President Yeltsin's initiative for the progressive implementation of the Vance-Owen plan is now taking place, Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev has declared. He was meeting journalists at the conclusion, on Wednesday evening, of talks with the foreign ministers of Great Britain, Spain, France, and Italy. "We proceed from the view that these consultations are going in the right direction," the minister said in reply to an ITAR-TASS correspondent's question. "The search is in progress for the best ways of implementing the international Vance-Owen plan."

The head of Russia's foreign policy department emphasized the importance of the accords reached on Mostar. "The sides agreed not only to a cease-fire, but also to several steps for normalizing the situation in a more substantial way," the minister told an ITAR-TASS correspondent. It also seems extremely important, Andrey Kozyrev thinks, that the sides regard the accords reached not as an isolated decision, but as a link in the total chain of the progressive implementation of the plan for a peaceful settlement. Thus, it can be said that our idea has already begun to operate in the localities, although I would, of course, warn against excessive optimism and euphoria, knowing the real situation there, A. Kozyrev pointed out.

"I am deeply convinced that the Vance-Owen plan is alive and in operation. This has been confirmed both by our consultations today and by yesterday's meetings with the leaders of the states of the former Yugoslavia. We will continue to put pressure on all the sides involved in the conflict, and not just in Bosnia, so as to continue the movement toward a peaceful settlement of the situation in the region. To this end, we will continue the consultations with all our partners and friends."

Speaking of the possibility of expanding the Russian military presence in the former Yugoslavia, A. Kozyrev stated that Russia is carrying out active work in the diplomatic field. He recalled that President Boris Yeltsin earlier expressed willingness to send observers to Bosnia as part of the UN peace-keeping forces. Russia's actions on that score will be based on UN Security Council decisions, the minister stressed. However, the question of the numbers of the Russian peace-keeping contingent can only be tackled once the Security Council has adopted the Vance-Owen plan and has devised a mechanism for implementing it. At the present stage, though, the minister emphasized, the main thing is to stop the bloodshed in Bosnia, and we will continue active consultations with our European and American partners.

At the conclusion of his visit to Italy, the Russian foreign minister will leave today for Washington, where consultations will take place with the U.S. administration, and later for New York, where he will have meetings in the Security Council.

'Let Down' by Clinton Doubts on Bosnia

PM2005123993 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 93 p 3

[Yevgeniy Fadeyev report: "Cool Reception"]

[Text] Belgrade, 19 May—This is a rare occurrence. There was not a single commentary in today's newspapers about Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev's visit to Belgrade. There was only a dry protocol report on his talks (and even that was not front-paged) with Yugoslav President D. Cosic, Serbian President S. Milosevic, and Montenegrin President M. Bulatovic.

Prior to this Kozyrev had visited Croatia, where, as he put it, he was happy with his meeting with Tudjman and Izetbegovic, who support the Vance-Owen Plan. The Belgrade newspapers tactfully failed to mention that the head of Moscow's diplomatic service could not keep from announcing in Split that he is in close contact with U.S. Secretary of State W. Christopher, but "dear Andrey's" friends let him down again.

While Kozyrev was explaining to his interlocutors that there is no alternative to the Vance-Owen Plan and that it should immediately be put into practice, U.S. President B. Clinton suddenly stated that he was not sure that the plan for Bosnia was still topical.

Naturally, the four "Russian initiatives" brought from Moscow as a "gift" to the Serbs have prompted no rejoicing in Belgrade.

The sanctions against the new Yugoslavia—the closure of the Serbia-Bosnia border, the urgent establishment of "closed zones," and the expedited "institution" of an international trial of war criminals in the former Yugoslavia—are just "peacemaking gestures"!

Arrives in Washington

LD2005130993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1253 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Excerpts] Washington, 20 May—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev arrived in Washington today for consultations on a settlement of the Yugoslav crisis. The U.S. capital is the final stage in a tour carried out by the head of the Russian foreign policy department in order to have discussions with the leadership of the former Yugoslav republics, the European states, and the United States on ways to settle the Balkan crisis. [passage omitted]

In the U.S. capital, talks are planned for the Russian minister with U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher, other high-ranking officials of the U.S. Administration, and leaders of Congress.

Rutskoy Comments on Using Force in Yugoslavia

LD1905012193 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2242 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Moscow, May 19 (TANJUG)—Russian Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy on Wednesday [19 May] said that neither force against Bosnian Serbs nor sanctions against the new Yugoslavia would solve anything, and that the way out of the crisis should be sought by the people of former Yugoslavia themselves in a conference.

History would never forgive us if we permitted force to be used in former Yugoslavia, said Rutskoy in a talk with the participants in a session of the steering committee for a conference of spiritually kindred nations.

Those would bomb the Serbs do not ask what is actually happening in those lands and what are the reasons for the present conflicts. What we have here is a fight for spheres of influence in international relations and foreign interests, he explained.

'Waning' U.S. Interest in Bosnia Seen

PM2005102593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 93 p 3

[Vladislav Drobkov report: "White House's Bosnia Failure"]

[Text] Washington, 19 May—After its failed attempt to persuade the Europeans to support the U.S. plan to launch air strikes against Bosnian Serb positions and lift the embargo on arms shipments to the Muslims, the Clinton administration has decided to take its time over new initiatives in the Balkans crisis. Moreover, as U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher stated, he will not even be taking part in the session of UN Security Council foreign ministers, scheduled for Friday in New York, at which it is planned to discuss the position in Bosnia once again.

These actions by the administration reflect not only its irritation with the "Europeans' lack of determination." The influential Senator J. Biden, for instance, has openly rebuked them for cowardliness and hypocrisy, demanding that Washington take resolute measures. The newspapers attest and politicians admit that there has been some notable tension between the transatlantic allies, and U.S. leadership has been damaged. The State Department is essentially admitting that if the United States tries to impose its will on the allies, a crisis between them could be inevitable. "We are not prepared to destroy the European-U.S. alliance after the end of the 'cold war' because of this problem," a ranking U.S. State Department staffer told journalists in Washington.

It is also a fact—and this has influenced the White House position much more than the Europeans' doubts—that the overwhelming majority of Americans themselves refuse to support the Washington politicians' interventionist intentions. As all recent opinion polls have convincingly shown, more than half the inhabitants of the United States oppose sending U.S. troops to Bosnia or bombing Serbian forces.

It is obvious that President Bill Clinton, whose popularity has dropped considerably over recent weeks, could not ignore this public mood. He has made a point of setting aside all foreign policy matters and focusing on domestic U.S. problems, and has set off from Washington on a tour of the country.

This has given a number of observers an excuse to state that Clinton's policy with regard to Bosnia has "been a complete failure." Bosnia is now being called the "new administration's first foreign policy defeat."

At the same time, despite the obvious waning of White House interest in Bosnian affairs, Washington is stating that the United States is not abandoning its plans to step up pressure on the Serbs—even including air strikes—or its intention to get the embargo on arms shipments to the Muslim forces lifted.

Incidentally, the Vance-Owen Plan is coming in for growing criticism here.

Against this backdrop the statements by representatives of the Russian Foreign Ministry, who are still praising the merits of the Vance-Owen plan, seem very strange. Or do some people again want to be "holier than thou?"

Russia Seen 'Seizing Initiative' on Bosnia, Vance-Owen

PM1905135593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Pavel Shinkarenko report: "Russia Seizing the Initiative"]

[Excerpts] Without awaiting the official results of the referendum in Bosnia, Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin has given the order to step up international efforts to settle the crisis in the Balkans. [passage omitted]

A meeting took place Sunday [16 May] in Moscow between the Russian Federation president and the cochairmen of the Coordinating Committee of the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Lord David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg (the latter, formerly Norwegian foreign minister, has replaced Cyrus Vance). The international mediators later had detailed talks at the Russian Foreign Ministry. The next step will be a brief but hectic foreign tour by Andrey Kozyrev, head of Russian diplomacy, and Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin, special representative of the Russian Federation president, of a number of European countries and America, during which they will hold international consultations with interested parties. Meetings have already taken place with German colleague Klaus Kinkel in Bonn; with the presidents of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, Franjo Tudjman and Alija Izetbegovic, in Split; and with the leaders of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Montenegro in Belgrade.

Tomorrow, the Moscow envoys will hold talks in Rome with the foreign ministers of a number of West European countries, and Thursday they are expected in Washington. Here there will be an exchange of views with leaders of the U.S. Administration, and the dialogue recently begun in Moscow with Secretary of State Warren Christopher will be continued. On Friday, the situation in the Balkans will be discussed in New York at a UN Security Council sitting at ministerial level.

The view of Muslim countries was taken into account when elaborating proposals. Before his departure, Vitaliy Churkin received the Pakistani and Saudi Arabian ambassadors, and in New York Andrey Kozyrev intends to discuss the Bosnian problem with colleagues from a number of countries from the Islamic Conference Organization.

"At the aircraft steps," as they say, ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI's correspondent spoke with Vitaliy Churkin. In answer to a question on whether Russia can completely rule out the option requiring armed intervention in Bosnian affairs, the deputy minister replied: "In our view, the world community's stance should be sensitive but firm—firm in respect of possible violators of the decisions being taken by the international community. It is within the bounds of just such an approach that the Security Council could examine the application of necessary measures, without excluding any possibilities."

"Nevertheless," Vitaliy Churkin continued, "we are banking on a peaceful outcome. The Security Council's future resolution should only be a framework document. Concrete proposals will be submitted by the UN Secretary General."

Another question—on the possible participation of Russian troop formations in maintaining order in the peace zones—produced this answer: "Russia, in principle, is prepared for this." To this end, my interlocutor added, Deputy Defense Minister General Gromov is being sent on the trip. There is also an agreement with the State Committee for Emergency Situations that their people could assume control over the borders.

So the Russian program—to enforce the Vance-Owen plan, as Andrey Kozyrev put it, not "in one fell swoop," but consistently and gradually—has been expounded. Judging from initial reaction, it is supported in Yugoslavia and beyond its borders. Only time will tell whether this initiative will prove effective.

West Ignores Serb Objections to Vance-Owen Plan

PM1905142393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 7

[Yuriy Glukhov report: "Yugoslavia: Procrustean-Bed Settlement"]

[Text] The thief Procrustes, a hero of Greek mythology, could rightly be considered the forefather of modern big-time political methods. Using familiar terminology, his basic principle could be defined as follows—the end result should match your previous plans. The mythical Greek's invention—the Procrustean bed prepared in two versions—is nothing other than two versions of a standard solution with a guaranteed outcome. In an attempt to get hold of the money bags of passersby, Procrustes made them fit his own standards, his own norms of "legal" confiscation. Short people were placed in a huge bed, while the long-limbed were put in a small one. The former were stretched to fit, the latter had "surplus" parts lopped off.

Among Procrustes' modern-day successors you will find B. Clinton, who is still finding his feet, and the unsinkable A. Kozyrev. The new world order which the United States is currently talking about and to which Russia is given its assent is based on the violent methods of the famous highwayman.

Take Yugoslavia.

At their referendum the Bosnian Serbs have just rejected the Vance-Owen plan, but who is interested in their opinion if the procrustean bed settlement has already been prepared? Their referendum is not being generally recognized as the legitimate and supreme expression of the people's will. Not even by Russian democrats, who are prepared in other circumstances to bend over backwards to prove, for instance, the legitimacy of the Russian referendum results that they need.

Bosnian Serb leader R. Karadzic is trying to get his message through to the peacemakers and explain the mutilations that the dismemberment of Bosnia under the Vance-Owen plan would result in. "According to these maps," he explains, "half of the Serbian population would be living under the domination of Muslims or Croats, while the other half would be in enclaves like Nagorno-Karabakh. They would be fighting all the time. We agree instantly with the peace plan, but not with the maps." But it is no use. The cries of the Bosnian Serbs are the lone voice of a man already condemned to be stretched or amputated.

It is as if the peacemakers do not want to recognize that the plan has already encouraged ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and has, for instance, provoked fighting between Croats and Muslims. This, incidentally, was predicted by former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger, who has called into question the idea of carving up territory. In his opinion, Bosnia "is not a nation in any but the geographic sense. It comprises Orthodox Serbs, Catholic Croats, and Serbs who turned to Islam during the period of Turkish rule. There are no Bosnians as such. It remains a mystery why it should be thought that the very same ethnic groups which refused to coexist in the relatively spacious Yugoslavia could exist in tiny Bosnia."

I would recall that the Vance-Owen plan envisages splitting Bosnia into 10 ethnic enclaves. The authors of the plan estimated that 20,000 men would be needed to patrol the borders. NATO gives different figures—70,000 to maintain the fragile peace when hostilities end, and no less than 200,000 if hostilities continue. There are currently around 14,000 "Blue Helmets" in the former Yugoslavia.

With such major doubts, obvious costs, and unforeseeable consequences one is struck by the Procrustean determination for an enforced settlement in Yugoslavia.

This is being demonstrated by the United States. U.S. military pressure was predetermined even before the results of the Bosnian Serb referendum.

This determination shines through Kozyrev's diplomacy, which intends to send a "limited" military contingent to Yugoslavia and does not balk at overt blackmail. Asked by ABC TV why he does not issue a direct warning to the Bosnian Serbs that they are being threatened with air strikes, the Russian disciple of Procrustes shared his diplomatic nuances. For those who believe in hell, he announced, it is sometimes more terrifying to know just what awaits them. An attractive prospect, is it not?

The U.S. Western partners are not so zealous. As THE SUNDAY TIMES notes, the cooling between Europe and America because of Bosnia has reached its nadir. B. Clinton was humiliated by not being able to convince the U.S. main European allies to support his desire to take resolute action.

On the other hand, the belligerence of the immediate authors of the plan is striking. I cannot think of an instance when an intermediary has been as aggressive as Lord Owen. The man whose mission is to provide "good offices" has called for strikes against those with whom he should be dealing only around the negotiating table, and has behaved like a representative of a warring faction. What kind of peace is it that has war at its very heart?

Procrustes' passion proved fatal for him. He passed away on his own bed. Admittedly, with the "mediation" of Theseus, who played the very same trick on him.

When fears are expressed that the Vance-Owen plan could have grave consequences for its supporters and participants, such fears are not groundless. The United States has the bitter experience of Vietnam and Lebanon. Russia and the other Union republics have the experience of Afghanistan. Every Goliath has his David, and every Procrustes his Theseus.

Churkin Holds Talks in Vatican on Bosnia

LD1905195493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1915 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Aleksey Golyayev and Georgiy Shemelev]

[Text] Vatican, 19 May—Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin had consultations in the Vatican today. He is a member of the delegation headed by Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrey Kozyrev on a visit here to gauge attitudes of (Russia's) European partners toward President Yeltsin's initiative on stopping the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina on the basis of the Vance-Owen plan.

During the talks in the Vatican the sides exchanged opinions on the most topical international problems with special stress put on the situation in the former Yugoslavia. They also examined the prospects of developing bilateral relations between Russia and the Vatican.

Shumeyko Upbeat About U.S. Talks, Administration

LD1905115793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1015 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov]

[Text] Washington, 19 May—Vladimir Shumeyko, Russian first deputy chairman of the government, called the outcome of meetings with high-ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration a success. "We were aware of full mutual understanding and support in the political battle which we are fighting today for the adoption of a new constitution," he said in an interview with the ITAR-TASS correspondent.

Shumeyko is on a working visit here and has had meetings with U.S. Vice President Al Gore; National Security Adviser Anthony Lake; Strobe Talbott, special adviser to the U.S. secretary of state on the newly independent states; and Assistant Defense Secretary William Perry. Shumeyko also had talks with Thomas Foley, speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and Robert Michel, leader of the Republican minority in the House.

Shumeyko said that "we discussed a whole range of issues: how events are going to develop in Russia politically and in the economy, how the constitution is to be adopted, and what relations are going to be like between the former republics of the USSR, now the CIS countries. I was very interested to find out the stance of the new administration on these very issues."

"It seemed to me during the meetings in the White House that the new administration is more dynamic, more like us," he said. Young politicians have come to power who are very aggressive in the good sense of the word, who take a business-like and keen approach. We like this very much. I like the politicians at this level whom I saw in the White House."

"I had to explain why President Boris Yeltsin and his supporters are insisting on the adoption of a new constitution for Russia," Shumeyko noted. It was necessary to explain that the struggle in Russia is not between the executive and legislative branches of power, because the two branches are proposing to have one authority, one "trunk." The struggle is between the omnipotence of the soviets and the completely new, presidential power which is coming into being. I am sure that the people I talked to understand our problems."

The first vice-premier said that during his stay in Washington he had numerous meetings with U.S. business representatives, many of whom showed enormous interest in the visit of the Russian delegation. "In line with the new allocation of duties in the government," he said, "I am responsible for the development of enterprise. So while in Washington I have had to combine dealing with political matters and discussing the problems of enterprise in Russia. I have had numerous scheduled and unscheduled meetings with American businessmen to discuss specific projects and more general problems. During the conversations it was also necessary to explain what is actually happening in Russia and how the political situation is going to develop in Russia."

Shumeyko is now visiting New York, where he will be having more meetings with American businessmen, before continuing his trip in Cuba.

U.S. Lack of Unanimity on Nuclear Test Moratorium Noted

PM1905152393 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 3

[Mikhail Pogorelyy report: "When There Is No Agreement..."]

[Text] The moratorium that Washington announced on nuclear tests last year under Bush expires 1 July. The new President will have to submit his proposals to Congress this month—to continue with the moratorium or to abandon it, to strive for an international agreement on the complete ending of nuclear testing in 1996 against a "nonnuclear backdrop" or to carry on with a series of low-yield (up to 1 kiloton) explosions until the possible signing of a treaty.

Clinton himself resolutely opposed nuclear testing during his election campaign. The same position is held by Defense Secretary Aspin and Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, who control nuclear munitions. The most influential senators and congressmen also advocate ending tests.

But there is no complete unanimity on this issue. The opponents of testing are themselves opposed above all by America's top military officials, representing the Joint Chiefs. Under the influence of their arguments about the need to monitor the combat capability and technical condition of warheads the Department of Energy has also adopted a not entirely definite position—particularly as regards the proposal to hold at least 15 tests before 1996.

Commentary on Resuming Nuclear Testing

LD1905165093 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 19 May 93

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] Russia would like to prolong the current nuclear test moratorium and make it permanent. This has been announced by a spokesman for the Russian Foreign Ministry. Commentary by Yuriy Solton:

Last time the former Soviet Union tested a nuclear bomb was on 24 October 1990 on a test field in the Novaya Zemlya Arctic archipelago. Then Russia proclaimed a one year official moratorium. Though its term has already expired Moscow continues to stick to it and does not plan a resumption of nuclear tests.

Of course everything will depend on the position of other nuclear club countries. So far their test fields have been silent. China set off the last nuclear charge a year ago. A bit earlier France suspended its nuclear program. Britain, whose nuclear components are tested on the American Nevada field, is de facto sticking to a moratorium during a nine month pause in the United States nuclear test program announced by the Congress. The American moratorium ends on 1 June.

So, much if not all will depend on Washington's decision expected to come in May. Opponents of nuclear tests remind President Clinton of his preelection pledge, to seek a total nuclear test ban by 1996. Participants in a regular session of the disarmament conference in Geneva are calling on the American Administration to prolong the moratorium, the more so that at the Vancouver summit the U.S. and Russian presidents agreed on the necessity to begin consultations on a wide international basis to discuss the problem of nuclear tests.

At last, START II stipulating a triple reduction of the two countries' strategic nuclear arsenals practically excludes the possibility of a nuclear conflict between them and provides favorable conditions for putting an end once and for all to nuclear explosions.

Washington's decision to resume nuclear tests would undoubtedly cause a chain reaction among nuclear powers and cast a shadow on the present confidential relations between them. This would serve as an invitation to other countries to develop nuclear weapons which would undermine efforts to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The Washington Administration has already taken a step in the right direction by giving up the program of Star Wars that required nuclear tests.

It remains to be seen whether Washington will take another step in the spirit of time toward a permanent nuclear moratorium.

Chernomyrdin Postpones Visit to Ukraine

LD2005091993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0857 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—"Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin's visit to Kiev, earlier scheduled for Thursday and Friday [20 and 21 May], has been postponed," ITAR-TASS was told by Valentin Sergeyev, head of the Russian Government's press service.

Asked about claims appearing in the Ukrainian press that the Russian premier's visit was intended to "save (Ukrainian premier) Leonid Kuchma" who is fighting with parliament to prolong his additional powers, Sergeyev said: "We are very much pleased that Ukrainian journalists assess the importance of the Russian premier's visit so highly. Though the visit to Kiev is being interpreted in this way, the postponement of Chernomyrdin's trip is really explained not by some sort of changes in the plans of our head of government," he added. "Everything is much simpler: the Ukrainian parliament is now discussing serious problems and Leonid Kuchma has to attend its meetings all these days."

Sergeyev added that the Russo-Ukrainian documents, expected to be signed during the visit, were now being completed by experts and would be even more significant. He said "Viktor Chernomyrdin's visit to Kiev will probably be held next week, while tomorrow, on Friday, the head of the Russian cabinet will undertake a one-day working visit to Ulyanovsk".

In connection with the postponement of today's meeting of the presidium of the Russian council of ministers to next week, Sergeyev said that this was because there was no quorum: most presidium members and several vice-premiers are now away on various missions.

Final Stage of Brigade Withdrawal in Cuba Continues

LD2005121793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0545 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Sereda]

[Excerpt] Havana, 20 May—The concluding stage of the withdrawal of the Russian military brigade from Cuba is continuing. On Wednesday [19 May], the vessel Cosmonaut Yuriy Gagarin left the port of Havana, heading for its native shores. On board are several hundred Russian servicemen and members of their families. [passage omitted]

DPRK Retaliates for Demands for Nonproliferation Compliance

PM1905151993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 93 First Edition p 3

[Vladimir Skosyrev report: "Tough Measures From Pyongyang"]

[Text] Beijing—The eight Russian nuclear specialists who left without Moscow's approval to work in the DPRK have returned home. According to informed sources, they were advising their North Korean colleagues engaged in implementing the nuclear program conceived by Kim Il-song, the founding father of the country.

However, after Russian representatives in Pyongyang reminded them of the commitment to guard state secrets which our scientists signed, the latter agreed to curtail their activity and returned home.

At least this incident, which threatened to cloud relations between Moscow and Pyongyang even further, can be considered. However, news is coming in from other "fronts" and it is scarcely reassuring. You get the impression that the DPRK wants to punish Russia as hard as possible for being rash enough to join with the West and virtually the whole world community in urging Pyongyang to resume cooperation with the IAEA and observe the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

In any event it can now be said that there has been a whole series of anti-Russian actions from the DPRK. One such action is the introduction of a 50-mile military protection zone in the Sea of Japan in addition to the generally accepted 12-mile territorial waters zone, an action which completely contradicts international maritime law.

Pyongyang has also warned Moscow that if the latter continues to "pressure" it over the nuclear problem, the project for the construction of the gas pipeline from Sakhalin to the DPRK and South Korea can be considered dead.

Finally, Russia's attempts to prompt North Korea to repay the debts that it owed to the USSR, debts assessed at no less than 3.5 billion rubles, are not meeting with success. It has to be said that Russian diplomacy is confronted with a difficult choice. If a resolution on economic sanctions is adopted at the next session of the UN Security Council on the DPRK's withdrawal from the Nonproliferation Treaty, they will hit our state's interests as well. After all, the volume of trade and economic cooperation between the Russian Federation and the DPRK (including logging operations by North Korean workers) is worth approximately $2 billion a year. Consequently, the sanctions option is undesirable as far as we are concerned: It would be preferable to resolve the conflict by means of "quiet diplomacy."

Sources Cited on Japan Document 'Leak'

PM1905132993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition pp 1, 3

[Sergey Agafonov report with Gennadiy Charodeyev commentary under general headline: "Tokyo Agitated Over New Sensation From Moscow: Moscow Regards 'Sensation' As Disinformation"]

[Text] Tokyo—[Agafonov] Japan's JIJI news agency has published a report that it has certain "secret documents" which purport to show that Russia intends to take a harsher tone in the discussion with Tokyo and regard the territorial question as nonexistent.

The content of this discovery by Japanese reporters is surely worth a more detailed description. According to the agency's information, this is a conceptual document entitled "Foreign Policy Ideals," compiled in Moscow, approved by the Russian Security Council, and dated 27 April 1993. JIJI presumes that this document was worked on mainly by experts from the Russian Ministry of Security, the Foreign Intelligence Department, the Defense Ministry, and other Russian analysts of a great power-conservative orientation, which is clear to the naked eye when you acquaint yourself with the text.

The agency asserts that the section of this document relating to Japan represents a 180-degree turn compared with the foreign policy concept elaborated by the Russian Foreign Ministry last fall: In place of the Foreign Ministry's compromise formulas on the need to overcome all obstacles to relations, including the territorial question, the new concept urges people "not to proceed on the basis of Japan's one-sided demands," to consider the "problem of the northern territories nonexistent," and to toughen the general tone of the dialogue with Tokyo, remembering that Russia's firmness in the episode of the postponement of Yeltsin's visit in September last year proved productive and actually led to a softening of Japanese approaches. In addition, the agency reports, the document calls for Moscow's intensified diplomatic efforts in the Asia and Pacific region with regard to America, China, and South Korea, sidelining Japan and taking note of its lack of interest in developing economic cooperation with Russia.

All the leading Japanese papers and the TV companies have carried this comment from JIJI with a brief commentary which notes that Russia is by all accounts reverting to the "Stalinist-Brezhnevite course" in contacts with Tokyo. The Foreign Ministry here, taken aback at the latest surprises from Russia, has reacted quite feebly, expressing timid doubts about the authenticity of the material obtained by the agency and citing the fact that no change of tone has been yet been noticed in working contacts with the Russian Foreign Ministry.

Prime Minister Miyazawa also said that the sensational information should be checked thoroughly before assessments are made, although he did suggest that, probably, an error had crept into the report. He confirmed, however, that from the Japanese viewpoint there will simply be no dialogue with Russia without the territorial debates. Speaking in Hiroshima Prefecture, the premier stated among other things that "the recognition of the existence of a territorial question between the two countries" is the "basis of mutual understanding between them" and that at the meeting with Yeltsin in Tokyo in July during the G-7 summit he will definitely raise the territorial question in the conversation.

There is no point repeating the other commentaries on the Japanese reporters' big find because the assessments and conclusions are not in themselves as interesting as the simple but very important question: What other surprises are to be expected from Moscow? Suppose that in a few days' time there is an official statement that the "Foreign Policy Ideals" document does not exist, or that it does exist but that it contains none of the things claimed by the Japanese—this will still not resolve the problem. Because the problem is not one of ironing out another wrinkle but of excluding the likelihood of such errors occurring in the first place. But that can happen only when the game of Russian diplomatic leapfrog ends and the foreign policy of a major country is conducted only by those who are competent to do so.

In many respects this is an abstract wish given the general craving of the executive, legislative, and other echelons of powers in Russian policy for a slice of the foreign policy pie. However, despite the appeal of such a "universal diplomacy," this "pie" itself will rapidly go stale. Moscow's declarations (all of them!) are devalued with the speed of the inflation that is consuming our ailing ruble—the more declarations, leaks, "trial balloons," and other experiments there are, the less confidence people have in Moscow.

A foreign policy concept can be conservative or ultraradical, but it comes from the team in power. This concept must be expounded, either in full or in abridged form and either by the president or the Foreign Ministry, or by no one at all. The general level of information about the internal discussions on this or that area should not be treated as a form of information striptease necessary in the period of the battle for democratic values....

However, all this is absurd—these are trivial, obvious, and natural truths.

[Charodeyev commentary] Various reliable sources in Moscow told IZVESTIYA the following: To all appearances Japan's JIJI agency has got it wrong. The title of the document is "Basic Provisions of the Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation." This document is actually marked "For Official Use." It was prepared by staffers of various state institutions and departments.

So far the document has not been published in full in the open press either in this country or abroad. "And consequently," as a senior state functionary who wished to remain anonymous noted, "no one is going to comment on the content of the document." He was wrong, however, because we were told at the Russian Foreign Ministry's Department of Information and the Press:

"To all appearances the Japanese press has been misled once more and the world public disinformed. This benefits primarily those forces which take a negative view of the normal development of relations between Tokyo and Moscow. The suggestion that any of the theses of 'Brezhnevite diplomacy' could be revived in Russian foreign policy is absurd and does not correspond to the facts. Russia has always regarded relations with Japan as one of the main priorities in its foreign policy and has proceeded and continues to proceed from the need to settle the problem of territorial demarcation.

"In view of the obvious absurdity of the proposition the Japanese mass media cite, it is impossible to identify the document they mention and consequently to confirm or deny its existence," the Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman stated.

One source also informed IZVESTIYA that, since no one has removed the "For Official Use" stamp from this document, the publication in the Japanese press could be considered an undesirable leak. It has come to light (according to information from the military department) that the leader of the group which prepared the document was fired from his job fairly recently. A thorough judicial investigation will be conducted into the "leak."

Ministry Asks Azerbaijan To Spare Condemned Men

PM1905133393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 93 First Edition p 2

[ITAR-TASS report: "Russian Foreign Ministry Urges Azerbaijan Authorities to Show Humanity"]

[Text] As ITAR-TASS reports, the Russian Foreign Ministry has issued a statement in connection with the death sentence passed by an Azerbaijani court on some former Russian servicemen.

The statement says among other things that, without going into a legal evaluation of this case and guided solely by considerations of humanity, the Russian side has appealed urgently, repeatedly, and at various levels to the authorities in the Azerbaijan Republic to approach the question of the fate of these Russian citizens from a standpoint of humanity, to show them leniency [sniskhoditelnost], and to resolve the question of their transfer to the corresponding Russian authorities. These appeals have been made via the Russian Embassy in Baku and the Russian Federation Defense Ministry and Military Prosecutor's Office. Russian President Boris Yeltsin has sent a personal letter on this matter.

The Russian Foreign Ministry has been instructed to ask the Azerbaijan Republic authorities to transfer the convicted men to Russian justice to serve their sentence. This would meet modern standards of humanity in regard to persons who have committed a crime and, in particular, would meet the corresponding provisions of the international pact on civil and political rights and documents of the CSCE. Such a step would be received very positively in Russia.

Greenpeace Protests at Atomic Energy Ministry

LD1905130693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1225 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Veronica Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—Representatives of Greenpeace blockaded the entrances to the Russian Federation atomic energy ministry today as a sign of protest against the planned further development of nuclear power.

A declaration made by the Russian government in December 1992 envisages the bringing into operation of 26 new nuclear reactors over the next 20 years.

A 15-metre placard with the words "nuclear power stations are death factories" was extended across the front of the building. Two activists chained themselves to doors, blocking the entrance to the building to hundreds of ministry workers.

26 models of power stations which had begun to explode, emitting sparks and thus symbolising the threat of accidents, were placed on the steps of the building.

Through this action the activists demonstrated their solidarity with tens of thousands of Russians who have written letters to Greenpeace expressing their disagreement with the government's decision to renew construction of nuclear power stations, said Dmitrii Litvinov, coordinator of Greenpeace campaigns in Russia, who is a journalist with U.S. citizenship.

According to Dmitrii Litvinov, it is unseemly to speak about the safety of Russian nuclear energy which "gave" us Chernobyl, Chelyabinsk, Tomsk and a large number of other accidents.

Data from the Ministry for Nuclear Energy show that last year there were 205 breakdowns in the work of nuclear power stations. Greenpeace activists are convinced that the likelihood of a new catastrophe increases with the introduction of each new reactor.

Georgy Kaurov, head of the ministry public relations department told ITAR-TASS that Greenpeace has practically no specialists who are qualified and have the authority to judge the work and safety of nuclear power stations. Greenpeace activists hampered the ministry's work for about one hour and naturally this led to protests.

Three Activists Detained

LD1905151093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1400 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] ITAR-TASS has learned that three of the Greenpeace activists who are protesting outside the building of Russia's Ministry of Nuclear Power have been detained by the Moscow militia. Aleksandr Knorre, a director of Greenpeace Russia, said that Greenpeace has not been able to find out on what grounds its activists are being detained.

Commentator Deplores Russia's Loss of Influence in Mideast

LD1905193493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1530 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Israel's Deputy Foreign Minister Yosi Beilin has called for deeper involvement by the U.S. Administration in the Middle East peace talks. If this does not happen, he stated, summing up the results of the ninth round of Arab-Israeli talks, these talks will again go in circles. Igor Surguchev gives our commentary:

[Surguchev] The round of Arab-Israeli talks that finished recently, alas, brought no tangible results, incidentally—like all those which preceded them. While admitting that the talks process going nowhere, Beilin is calling on the United States to take a more direct part in them, seeing in this the key to progress at the talks. I do not see anything wrong if the Americans respond to Israel's call; there has long been a need for some movement forward at the Arab-Israeli talks, though there is the danger that the United States will as usual act in favor of their strategic ally in the Middle East.

But one thing stands out—neither Israel nor the Arabs are making such an appeal to the second co-chairman of the Middle East process—Russia. In my view, this is to admit indirectly that Moscow clearly does not fit the role of prime mover in the talks. It is obvious, and to some extent explainable, that Moscow is not leading the Middle East orchestra—Russia has too many serious, urgent problems, at home and in foreign policy. But it is sad that she seems to have lost face altogether in Middle East affairs, having turned into a shadow of the United States. The cooperation and interaction of the two sponsors of the Middle East peace process is of course desirable and even necessary, but I do not think that this cooperation should turn into deference and quiet consent with the United States by Russia on every issue, all the more so since Washington, famous for its pro-Israeli sympathies, does not always behave like an objective, honest mediator. Take at least the unfortunate case when Israel did not fulfill UN Security Council resolutions on the Palestinian deportees. It is clear to all that the United States helped Israel to avoid carrying them out, and all the other members of the Security Council, including Russia, closed their eyes to this. As a result, for five months the deportation of nearly 400 people to South Lebanon has defied international law, poisoned the atmosphere at the Arab-Israeli talks and, I believe, damaged Russia's prestige in the eyes of the Arab world. The lack of principles in this question and Russia's generally passive approach to the issue of a settlement in the Middle East leads us to think that Moscow as the co-chairman in the peace process is simply being there, as they say, and naturally, you ask why and who needs this?

Khasbulatov, RSA Envoy Note Shared Reform Principles

PM1905161193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition p 1

[Supreme Soviet Parliamentary Press Service report: "Social Consensus Will Resolve All Problems"]

[Text] Gerrit Cornelius Olivier, Republic of South Africa ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, was received by Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov 18 May, the Supreme Soviet Parliamentary Press Service reports.

Ruslan Khasbulatov noted the closeness of the principles determining reform of the system of state power in the two countries. He acknowledged that hastiness in making the transition from an old society to a new one is out of place. Answering a question about the possibility of compromise between the president and the Supreme Soviet and the issue of adopting a new Constitution, Ruslan Khasbulatov replied that compromise is inevitable. "Otherwise there will be no president or parliament, just a path toward political nonexistence." The content of the transitional processes in Russia today, Khasbulatov opines, is determined not so much by the constitutional crisis as by economic failures. "It is precisely within the sphere of socioeconomic reforms," he acknowledged, "that social consensus has been noted, and if this is achieved Russia will resolve all its constitutional and other problems."

Mr. Olivier expressed hope of Russian support for the progressive democratic transformations being undertaken by the De Klerk government in the Republic of South Africa. In his opinion, economic success is important for both Russia and the Republic of South Africa. "Otherwise the right- and left-wing radicals will unite in order to oppose the centrist forces." Gerrit Cornelius Olivier acknowledged that the political reforms process in the Republic of South Africa has reached the point where a return to the past is already impossible. "We are no banana republic where it is possible to stage a coup by capturing a radio station or the central square," the ambassador said.

The interlocutors expressed the conviction that cooperation between the two countries, which used to be limited merely to opening up Antarctica, will gather pace and become an important factor in determining the success of the reforms.

Council of Europe Officials on Ties With Russia

PM1905142793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition p 3

[Yuriy Kovalenko report: "The 'Estonian Incident' Will Not Affect Cooperation With Russia But Will Probably Be Taken into Account When Admitting Latvia into the Council of Europe"]

[Text] Strasbourg—Since the explosion of bitter polemics at the Palais d'Europe caused by Moscow's abortive attempts to obstruct Estonia's admission to the Council of Europe and Andrey Kozyrev's subsequent refusal to go to Strasbourg to attend the meeting of that organization's Committee of Ministers, passions have rapidly subsided.

At least, the leaders of the Council of Europe did everything to put an end to the "incident" connected with the Russian demarche, which they viewed as "interference." Even if Moscow were somehow right, Strasbourg believes, it should present its dissatisfaction in more "elegant" garb and find other methods of expressing its righteous anger.

Be that as it may, immediately after the admission of Estonia, Lithuania, and Slovenia, the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, under the chairmanship of British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, held a special sitting on relations with Russia. Agreement was reached at the meeting on broadening cooperation with Moscow in all areas.

At a press conference the British foreign secretary expressed the hope that Russia would join the Council of Europe as a full member at the earliest possible opportunity as part of the process of integrating it into Europe. Russia is participating in a number of Council of Europe projects, D. Hurd went on to remind the meeting, and the Committee of Ministers has approved a special program of assistance to Russia in the sphere of human rights, constitutional law, and jurisprudence.

Speaking about the main features of the program, Catherine Lalumiere, secretary general of the Council of Europe, noted first of all the need for a continuation of the political dialogue with Moscow and of top-level meetings.

The Council of Europe, C. Lalumiere said subsequently, is ready to appraise Russia's new Constitution and its most important laws and assess their compatibility with European standards. In addition, Russia will have to sign a number of such Council of Europe documents as the European conventions on human rights, the mutual recognition of diplomas, the rights of ethnic minorities, the extradition of criminals, and other documents.

Another sphere of cooperation named by the Council of Europe secretary general was the training of specialists. There are projects for this purpose which envisage the development of local democracy, the training of lawyers, and the reform of the prosecutor's office—a legacy of the communist regime. Another aspect is the organization of work experience for representatives of Russian law enforcement agencies. In short, Russia, which presently has special guest status at the Council of Europe, will be able to take part on a wide scale in the activity of this organization, which currently has 29 members.

Deputy Premier Fedorov Comments on IMF

LD1705195493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 17 May 93

[By correspondent Natalya Chernyshova; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Deputy Premier Boris Fedorov spoke at his news conference about the IMF decision to open a special credit line for countries that are at present undergoing transformation. This special credit will amount, in Russia's case, to $3 billion. Of this, $1.5 million will be delivered to us within an unprecedentedly short period of time, until 1 July. The rest will follow in autumn. The credit is for six years, but the interest rate has not been decided yet.

Boris Fedorov stressed that it will be ready cash, that will help in stabilizing the financial situation in the country. Incidentally, countering criticism that dollar injections are only promised, never delivered, the deputy premier said that last year we received $10 billion in goods credits plus $1 billion in cash.

At the same time, the government and the Central Bank have to prepare a joint statement on economic activity in 1993. This should envisage ways toward financial stabilization, a sharp cut—of up to 40 percent—in expenditure, and a moratorium on all new expenditure, including social, until the end of the year. After all, the May pay rise alone increased the budget deficit from 3 billion rubles [R] to R7 billion. The only way a man in the street can feel the effectiveness of reform is through a drop in inflation.

Answering a question on how the state would pay back its goods commitments—that means Urozhay-90 and other such schemes—the deputy premier said that in all likelihood a money equivalent would be determined shortly. As for a solution with regard to a mechanism to compensate people's saving, it is yet to be found.

In conclusion, Boris Fedorov welcomed the introduction of Kyrgyzstan's own currency. He stressed that an independent state has to strive toward a monetary system of its own.

Shokhin Briefs Press on IMF, EC

MK1905120693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 3

[Svetlana Sukhova, Nataliya Kalashnikova report: "Aleksandr Shokhin Press Conference. Russia Demands From Partners Observance of Rules of the Game"]

[Text] **Judging by Russian Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin's press conference yesterday, Russia has accumulated economic problems in recent days: ranging from talks on the creation of an economic and monetary union within the CIS framework, to Russia's relations with the IMF and EC. The vice premier noted, as he spoke of the Commonwealth's problems, that progress toward an economic union must, in the final analysis, benefit Russia. In this connection, Russia will be demanding that its partners observe certain rules as a new unity takes shape. He said in particular that it has to be explained right now to all CIS states that an economic union means forfeiting some sovereignty, not only economic but also political.**

The initiative to form an economic union, Shokhin believes, is attributable to the fact that the CIS states have at last realized that "economic independence is costing far too much, and many would like to see an economic union primarily as a customs union where Russia would lift all energy export duties." In reality, Russia sees such a union more broadly and links membership in it with "a strict coordination of economic policy and observance of shared rules of the game." Shokhin believes that a long transition period will be needed before the union has taken shape. The vice premier said that export duty rates are best altered during such a period with domestic energy prices having come close to world prices ("the duties would then wither away by themselves") rather than on the strength of a treaty of the union having been signed. As for a monetary union, Shokhin's position is that "it could be achieved quicker and easier via national currencies."

Still on the currency topic, Shokhin also touched upon Russia's relations with the IMF: According to IMF officials, Moscow is to get, as early as June, the first part ($1.5 billion) of the $3 billion credit promised to it. The problem, Shokhin thinks, is not so much how to dispose of the money, but rather a specific mechanism for getting the money. Shokhin thinks it is a good idea to "let in half the sum via the CIS." This means taking as little as possible out of the money in the form of a credit to Russia, but letting the IMF grant it to, for example, Ukraine in order to pay for maintaining supplies of oil and gas. Thus, Russia would get the same money free (without having to pay interest, that is.) According to Shokhin, his superiors were in a state of shock when he presented these ideas to the IMF, but now they are already pondering the idea.

Shokhin also made known Boris Yeltsin's visit to Norway planned for 20 June where he is going to meet with all 12 EC leaders. The signing of a treaty between Russia and the Community has been planned for this period as well. With time running short, the text of the treaty still contains at least 10 "uncoordinated positions." Russia, according to Shokhin, does not want to sign a "standardized treaty" like those the EC has already signed with a number of non-European developing countries.

Political Issues

Yeltsin Meets With Regional Administration Leaders

LD2005082993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0812 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—"There has been no production slump in Russia from February to May, and if this continues, we shall be able to say that 1993 will be a year of economic stabilisation," Russian President Boris Yeltsin said here today meeting the recently elected heads of administrations from Amur, Bryansk, Lipetsk, Orel, Penza and Smolensk regions, and from the Krasnoyarsk territory. The meeting was also attended by Chairman of the Council of Heads of Administrations Anatoliy Tyazhlov.

Having congratulated the regional leaders on the population's trust in them, Yeltsin noted that they were elected in a very difficult period, although the peak of the recession was already over. He stressed the importance of establishing close working relations with the heads of the administrations.

The presidential press service is expected to release a report on the results of the meeting.

Leaders Pledge Support

LD2005105493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1029 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin's meeting with newly elected heads of territorial and regional administrations, held in the Kremlin today, was marked "by a frank exchange of views on the progress of reforms at regional level. It carried out a comparative analysis of the progress of privatisation and creation of joint-stock companies, discussed the factors that had influenced the results of the referendum," the presidential press service reported today.

"The newly elected heads of administrations pledged their full support to the president's course in the implementation of political and economic reforms," the report says.

"The meeting touched on problems of decentralisation, optimal combination of strict regulation and local jurisdiction. It was stressed that the federal authorities should finance and implement large-scale federal programmes. The crediting policy in the sphere of agriculture was discussed, particularly questions of crediting the upcoming harvesting effort. The president informed the heads of administrations about his efforts to politically ensure the dynamics on the ongoing reforms, including at international level. Boris Yeltsin dwelt on the progress of the constitutional process and on preparations to hold a constitutional assembly."

Chernomyrdin, Others Speak at 'Anticrime' Commission

LD1905163993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1530 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] The press service of the Russian president has reported on a session of the interdepartamental anticrime commission. Viktor Chernomyrdin, chairman of the state commission investigating the 1 May events, made a speech today. It was noted that the existence of extremist political groups represents a serious threat to society. Viktor Yerin, minister of internal affairs; Viktor Barannikov, security minister; Valentin Stepankov, procurator general, and Yevgeniy Primakov, head of the Foreign Intelligence Service, spoke on the need for urgent measures to step up the struggle against crime and corruption.

Commission Stresses Fighting Crime

LD1905180393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 19 May 93

[Video report by correspondent I. Zargaryan—from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A sitting of the Russian Federation Security Council's interdepartmental commission on the fight against crime and corruption was held today in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of President Yeltsin and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin. It was the first sitting of the commission since its work was headed by Boris Yeltsin instead of Aleksandr Rutskoy.

[Zargaryan] According to the president's press service, a report by Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin on the results of the work of the state commission that he heads on the investigation of the May Day events was heard at today's sitting of the commission. Internal affairs and security bodies are still continuing their work. But the investigation already carried out has confirmed the existence of a plan for political provocations. Previously trained fighters took part in the action against the forces of law and order. Cobblestones were delivered to the site of the disorder in trucks.

The commission favored adoption of a presidential decree on action by federal power bodies to protect society from political provocations by extremist forces. It was noted at the sitting that organized crime and corruption have been transformed into a statewide political problem, and stress was laid on the special danger of ethnic mafia groups.

[Announcer] The unanimous view was expressed at the sitting of the commission that it is necessary to take tough measures to halt the actions of criminal elements. It was felt to be expedient to draw up a state program for the fight against crime and to submit it to Russia's Security Council.

Yeltsin Addresses Commission

LD1905203393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2020 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—An interdepartmental commission for combating crime has completed its work on Wednesday [19 May]. Members of the commission have acknowledged it expedient to work out a state programme for combating crime and submit it to the Security Council.

The meeting, chaired by Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, was addressed by the Interior Minister Viktor Yerin, Minister for Security Viktor Barannikov, Russian Prosecutor General Valentin Stepankov and chief of the Foreign Intelligence Service Yevgeniy Primakov.

Participants in the meeting pointed out that organised crime and corruption have turned into a state political problem and a serious distabilising factor in the life of the country. They emphasised the particular danger of ethnic mafia groups. The criminal situation in the country is worsening because of the growing drug addiction, alcoholism and insufficient control over the sales and spread of weapons.

Addressing the meeting, the Russian President Boris Yeltsin demanded more resolute actions from the interior and security ministries for combating crime and corruption. A unanimous opinion was expressed to take tough measures to cut short the activities of criminal elements.

Paper Carries Correction to Constitution Draft

PM1905150593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition p 2

[Editorial Office "Correction"; for draft constitution see FBIS-SOV-93-091-S Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT Supplement: "Constitutional Commission's Draft Constitution;" correction appears page 11, column one, first partial paragraph]

[Text] The draft of the Russian Federation Constitution published in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 8 May 1993 contained an error:

In Article 74, the third paragraph of Part (I), the word "Simbirsk" should be omitted after the word "Sakhalin" and the word "Ulyanovsk" should be included after the word "Tyumen."

Yeltsin To Sign Constitutional Conference Decree

LD1905181493 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 19 May 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A presidential decree on the status, structure, and procedure of the work of the Constitutional Conference will be signed no later than Friday [21 May]. This was announced today at a news conference by representatives of the Public Committee of Democratic Organizations and the Russian Union of Cossack Troops on the results of their meeting with Boris Yeltsin on 17 May.

Khasbulatov Calls For Legal Adoption of Constitution

LD1905150893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1423 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—Only the constitutional forms of adopting a new fundamental law of Russia exist, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia Ruslan Khasbulatov said at today's meeting with participants of the round table of political parties and public organisations. "Any other way is disastrous, and I do not intend to follow that way," the parliament speaker stressed.

"Unfortunately, we have now to choose between a not very good draft constitution and an openly bad one," the head of parliament said. Ruslan Khasbulatov welcomed the fact that the leading political forces are taking part in the working out and adoption of a new constitution. "Every fresh thought will only improve the contents of the fundamental law of the state," the parliament speaker noted.

The working out of a new Russian Constitution in confrontational conditions between the two branches of power is inadmissible, the participants of the meeting said. According to leaders of parties and movements, broad sections of the public should become a kind of "reconciling buffer" between the confronting branches of power. The representatives of the round table stressed that they had agreed in principle to take part in the work of the Constitutional Assembly called upon to find an accord among all the sides in the constitutional process, as well as to create the mechanism for adopting a new fundamental law of the Russian Federation.

Rutskoy Stresses Search for 'National Concord'

LD1905153793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1503 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—"The constitutional process must not result in Russia's division into winners and losers, supporters and opponents of any draft new constitution. It would be ruinous for Russia," Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy said here today.

A document to the effect says "the adoption of a new Russian constitution becomes a chief political priority, a major stage of our progress towards the consolidation of Russian democracy and unity on the basis of real federalism.

"The adoption of the new constitution should not become another battlefield for various power branches, political parties and movements. Its elaboration should not repeat negative experience of the former Soviet Union or lead to tragic aftermath for the Russian people and state.

"We should achieve the opposite: Turn the constitutional process into a way of achievement of national concord, consolidation of Russian federal statehood and creation of conditions for the reforms in the interests of entire society.

"Recent political processes revealed striving of sensible moderate politicians in all power branches to use concord for the elaboration of a new Russian constitution. Being the Russian vice president, I support the tendency, which is, actually, the search for national concord, and am ready for cooperation for the sake of its achievement," says the statement.

Khizha Under Investigation for Arms Smuggling

LD1905163693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1546 GMT 19 May 93

[By CRIMEPRESS correspondent Sergey Oleynik for TASS]

[Text] Moscow, 19 May—The CRIMEPRESS correspondent has learned from well-informed sources that a criminal case concerning an attempt to take out of Russia a large consignment of weapons has been instituted and an investigation is now in progress under the personal supervision of Procurator General Valentin Stepankov. The investigation bodies have not yet named the country where the weapons were going, or their type. It is an established fact that the investigator in charge of the case is actively involved in interrogating Georgiy Khizha, a former Russian deputy premier and members of his staff.

Sobchak, Yavlinskiy, Volskiy To Set Up New Party

MK1905113093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 12

[Sergey Slyusarenko report: "Anatoliy Sobchak Sets Up His Own Party. Sobchak, Yavlinskiy, Volskiy To Join New Party"]

[Text] Speaking at a constitutional hearing at the Tavricheskiy Palace yesterday, St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak expressed his intention to set up a new national party knit together by the idea of federalism. In Sobchak's view, this party may turn into a real force within the next two to three months when a new constitution is adopted and early parliamentary elections are called.

Anatoliy Sobchak has repeatedly said that at present Russia does not have a single political party (except for the revived Communist Party) that would be able to form a new government should it win the election. Speaking at the constitutional hearings at the Tavricheskiy Palace yesterday, Anatoliy Sobchak said that he was already conducting talks with representatives of a number of Russian regions and also political parties and movements about setting up a new national party guided by the idea of federalism. He added that Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, a well-known economist; Arkadiy Volskiy, leader of Civic Union; and Aleksandr Yakovlev, former adviser to the Soviet president, agreed in principle to the creation of such a party.

Anatoliy Sobchak said also that he himself did not lay claim to the role of the new party's leader. In his view, it should be a young promising politician prepared to run for the Russian presidency at the next elections who should lead it. In addition, Sobchak argued for "presidential" democracy: as he put it, in the transition period we are undergoing now, an unprofessional parliament that does not reflect the actual balance of political forces and, therefore, is unable to make serious decisions, may plunge Russia into chaos, which is bound to bring about a dictatorship. In Sobchak's view, a constitutional monarchy would be the best possible form of government for Russia. But precisely because the country does not have political figures of the caliber of King Juan Carlos of Spain, capable of uniting the whole nation, the St. Petersburg mayor set about creating a new party.

Parties, Unions Urge Yeltsin To Hold Constituent Assembly

MK1905100093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Unattributed report under the "Constituent Assembly" rubric: "Letter to the Russian President by Political Parties, Organizations"]

[Text] A group of political parties, public organizations, and trade unions, including the Social Democratic Party of Russia, the Russian Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and others (a total of 11 organizations) has sent an open letter to Boris Yeltsin expressing "concern over the way the constitutional process is proceeding in the country."

Representatives of the political and public organizations do not accept the mechanism for adopting a constitution, because they believe that recently "the work of the various branches of government on the constitution has been guided by political expediency."

The authors of the appeal consider it dangerous for Russia's constitutional order that at present heads of the executive and legislative branches of the republics, krays, and oblasts of the Russian Federation have in effect become the key participants in the constitutional process. "The process of reaching agreement on the draft constitution (which so far has not been adopted as a basis by anyone) with the heads of the components of the Federation is turning the fundamental law into some kind of an agreement between the current horizontal structures of power, an appendix of sorts to the already signed Federation Treaty—and the very future of the Russian state into a downright contractual pledge," the appeal says. The authors of the open letter to the president are convinced that the new constitution should not be put into effect by any of the incumbent authorities, because this would result in Russia's collapse. This is why representatives of the political parties, public organizations, and trade unions believe that the constitutional order of the new Russia should be established by an all-Russian constituent assembly elected specifically for this purpose by Russian citizens by secret ballot on the basis of equal, direct, and universal suffrage. The letter emphasized that "an edict on the procedure for holding elections to the Russian constituent assembly could be issued by the president as the sole public office holder in the country whose legitimacy was reaffirmed by expression of the popular will on 25 April."

PRAVDA Denies Referendum Results Give Yeltsin Mandate

PM1905105393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 3

[Unattributed untitled article]

[Text] There are said to be three kinds of lies—lies, damn lies, and statistics. But, it seems, there is also a fourth kind, which is probably the most loathsome—the false interpretation of statistics. This is what is happening with the results of the recent referendum. They are being interpreted every which way, until they completely lose any meaning.

Judge for yourselves.

THERE ARE 107 MILLION PEOPLE IN RUSSIA ENTITLED TO VOTE.

ONLY 40 MILLION GAVE THE "GREEN LIGHT" TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS TEAM.

How can people talk about a crushing victory for the president and his policy? But they do. And in an unblushing, self-satisfied way.

And whose victory is it over whom—that of 40 million Russian citizens over the other 67 million Russian voters? Or of the president over the entire people of the Russian Federation? But only tyrants or occupying powers can celebrate a victory over a people.

Why is all this being done? Essentially all the prereferendum promises have been completely forgotten—and, we would recall, those were promises to the tune of several TRILLION rubles. On the other hand, the draft new constitution that was commissioned to order and to suit B. Yeltsin's presidential ambitions is being forcibly pushed through by hook or by crook. The Russian Federation president's entourage assures us that at the referendum the people gave him a mandate to adopt a new constitution and, above all, to sidestep the Congress of People's Deputies and the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

This is a pure lie.

First, THE QUESTION OF THE CONSTITUTION WAS NOT PUT TO THE REFERENDUM.

Second, in order to have a mandate to resolve constitutional matters, it would have been necessary to win more than half of the votes of those entitled to vote. B. Yeltsin did not win that number—he gained just 37.7 percent. Nonetheless, he is carrying on regardless with his own back-pocket [karmannyy] constitution, and inventing all kinds of improvised means to achieve his goal.

THE PEOPLE DID NOT VOTE IN THE REFERENDUM FOR A DICTATORSHIP.

The people want a proper life, not another decorative, declarative constitution, under which whoever has more rights is always right.

Constitutional 'Battle' 'Endangering' Russian Unity

PM1905104793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition pp 1, 3

[Vladimir Kuznechevskiy commentary under the "Forecast" rubric: "Crisis May Be Averted, But Regime Needs To Be Replaced"]

[Text] Is the prospect of becoming like the English queen a real one for Yeltsin? Who has prepared a trap for whom? And will there be a new referendum?

Well now, the president is set to convene a constitutional conference of representatives of Federation subjects 5 June which should, according to the presidential team's original plan, provide an opportunity to ratify the so-called "presidential draft" of the Constitution.

On the day it was announced Ruslan Khasbulatov described this as "a trap." For whom? For, it seems, Yeltsin himself.

Ever since the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies, Yeltsin's closest advisers have been steadily trying to persuade their chief that the deputies allegedly have a cunning plan to turn the Russian president into the English queen—that is, a monarch without real levers of power.

The chief executive would seem to have fallen for this....

A pitched battle over the Constitution is unfolding on Russia's territory. Both the president and the Supreme Soviet are forced to fight for the provinces, because votes there will ultimately determine the kind of state system which will exist in Russia in the immediate, historic future.

The opposing sides have reached the same conclusion. However, they are acting in different ways. For the last

18 months Khasbulatov has been deliberately and subtly trying to persuade Federation subjects that the forms and methods of implementing economic reform ought to be amended, at the same time never losing sight of the idea of Russia's unity in the economic and political area (and this means preserving the institution of the presidency too). Yeltsin meanwhile, scarcely realizing that the fate of the dispute was being decided in the provinces, launched an immediate and unremitting attack on the actual institution of representative power, proposing in his draft Constitution that the role of the federal parliament be reduced to a simple supplement for the monarchical power of the president (like the Fourth State Duma under the sovereign emperor, which he dissolved "as not wanted"). Under the "presidential draft," the local legislative organs simply hover in a legal and political vacuum.

But where is the trap contained in all the president's recent moves? Indeed, everything resides in the Federation subjects themselves. In order to gain the upper hand over the Supreme Soviet and draw the sympathies of leaders of local authorities onto his side, the president is forced to promise them something. And what can he promise apart from broader autonomy? So he promises that. And the Supreme Soviet is compelled to join this race and to make promises too.

Should this process continue until fall, it will be the provinces, whose rights will increase significantly, who will emerge as victors by the time the new Constitution is adopted. Then Russia really will have a president with the rights of the English queen. But good luck to him, the president. Something else is endangering the unity of Russia: There will be a drastic fall in the real influence of the parliament and government, which is not the case in, say, Great Britain and Germany. There the provinces, including the free state of Bavaria, do not have absolute rights in respect of the central organs of power.

Does the president see this? Perhaps he does see it, otherwise he would not have enshrined in the draft Constitution that he has proposed harsh authoritative prerogatives for the president which in no way accord with his promises about extending the rights of Federation subjects.

The 13 May statement by 11 republics on nonacceptance of the presidential draft Constitution shows that, if the president continues to insist on the speedy adoption of his draft Constitution in avoidance of the legal procedure, he will actually clear the way for the collapse of Russia's unified statehood.

Here is a concrete example. Tatarstan Supreme Soviet Chairman Mukhametshin (who, incidentally, did not sign the statement by the 11) said in a Radio Liberty interview that Tatarstan's parliament would not examine any draft Russian Constitution until a bilateral treaty had been signed between Moscow and Kazan.

There can be no doubt, however, that once such a treaty has been signed Kazan will probably declare that the Russian Constitution is the Fundamental Law of another state, that it has nothing to do with Tatarstan, and that Tatarstan will neither approve nor denounce it. In that case a republic will emerge within Russia which will transfer to confederative relations with the Russian Federation. And this will mean that any draft Constitution for the federal state will flounder, again without being adopted.

If you believe Sergey Filatov, chief of the Presidential Administration, Yeltsin intends to make the final stage of the battle for his draft Constitution a referendum on its basic provisions.

However, we saw on 25 April what a referendum on constitutional questions can produce. It is unlikely to produce a constitutional electoral majority. And if you assume that even one Russian republic or oblast refrains from taking part in the referendum at all (this is possible), it will mean only one thing—they will automatically drop out of the constitutional area of the Russian Federation. This is the final stage in the process not only of Russia's fragmentation but also of the collapse of its statehood.

Are the president and his radical entourage aware of the process they are setting in motion?

Certain information indicates that there is no unanimity in the president's camp. For instance, current favorite Sergey Shakhray insists on an immediate and radical departure, overstepping the bounds of existing constitutional norms, and the overthrow of the constitutional organs of power.

But Gennadiy Burbulis, organizer of the president's referendum campaign, thinks otherwise: "Some people dream of the salutary idea of convening a Constitutional Assembly, while others are urging the president to introduce a new Constitution by decree."

The political situation in the country can be described on the whole as stalemate. None of the rival political sides has a firm and powerful social and political support. And the country and the society cannot go on existing in conditions of what is to all intents and purposes impotence and the collapse of statehood.

New Constitution Has 'Minefield' To Cross

PM1905153593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Andrey Kolesnikov article: "The Constitutional Minefield"]

[Text] Apart from those figures traditionally found at the center of public attention—such as the "collective Rasputin," Khasbulatov, and Zorkin—Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Nikolay Ryabov can be named "man of the week" (and maybe not just for one week.) This politician's service record gave no grounds at all to suspect him of sympathizing with the "collective Rasputin." However, a fact remains a fact: Ryabov supported the idea of setting up a Constitutional Conference, proceeding from the premise that deepening of confrontation between the branches of power should be avoided. Supported by Soviet of the Republic Chairman Veniyamin Sokolov, parliamentary "dissident" Nikolay Ryabov proposed a discussion of both drafts of the Constitution and joint work on them at the Constitutional Conference, including in conjunction with members of the Constitutional Commission. The idea for joint work on a general draft Constitution, which would embrace the best of both preliminary versions of the Fundamental Law, was expressed by V. Sheynis, member of the Constitutional Commission and people's deputy. Viktor Chernomyrdin noted cautiously that both sides mighty sit around the negotiating table. So the idea of fusing the two draft Constitutions on a constructive basis is in the air. As we can see, politicians whose political views do not coincide have spoken out in favor of this approach. It is possible that they are all driven by fears of a fatal outcome for both parties as a result of so-called "Constitution races."

The Constitution battle has also been joined by various political parties and movements. The Communists even undertook a purely fictional creation—a draft "Soviet Constitution" is being feverishly created right now. Surely it would have been easier to return to the original version of the Brezhnev Constitution—at least it was drafted professionally.

During a "roundtable" of political parties and movements, a group of legal experts was set up, to be led by Oleg Yemelyanovich Kutafin, rector of the Moscow Judicial Institute, who, without the slightest qualm, declared that the president's team contains no lawyers competent in the sphere of state law. This sentence loses its paradoxical meaning if you recall that Professor Kutafin himself is, indeed, a worthy specialist, but in Soviet state law.

It has to be said that the president's position is complicated by the none too clear expression of support for the new draft on the part of the regional political elite. At any rate, so far the tally of supporters and opponents of this version of the Constitution from among the leaders of both branches of power in the Federation components is highly conditional and approximate in nature. The regions are a breed of political "brokers," who will support one or other draft depending on changes in the political situation.

All these events and the almost shocking statements by various political and fringe-political [okolopoliticheskiye] figures prove that, sooner or later, to prevent the constitutional field from becoming a minefield, the authors of both drafts will have to sit around the negotiating table, and, mark my words, around a common worktable.

Of course, even in circumstances of the utmost politeness toward one another by the eminent negotiating sides, it will be very difficult to resolve the main problem. This problem concerns distributing the weight of authority between the president, the government, and the parliament. In any case, the abolition of the Congress of People's Deputies and the creation of a bicameral parliament at the very least would be a major victory for our "semi-constitutionalism" [nedokonstitutsionalizm]. It is possible to find universally acceptable versions of "checks and balances" and more flexible forms of separation of powers, but all of this is pointless without settling the problem of the Congress.

The question is whether or not this problem can be solved. It is obvious that Zorkin, Rutskoy, and Khasbulatov will not renounce their sympathies toward the Congress, and that they will take up an extremely rigid stance on this issue. The successes of Karamzin and Solovyev are a source of great envy for Ruslan Imranovich, who undertook an historical public information exercise [publitsistika], publishing an article in PRAVDA ambiguously entitled "Let's Take a Look at the Birth of the Fatherland." The historical pamphlet by the evidently erudite Khasbulatov, proofs of whose work were left virtually for years, according to witness accounts, to gather dust in the editorial "reserves" when Ivan Frolov, fussy in issues of editing, was PRAVDA's chief editor, is now being published enthusiastically in the very same newspaper but under another editor, less demanding in terms of text quality. As absurd as it may sound to the ears of a normal individual, the pamphlet is directed against... servility toward the West, including in questions of "state structure." All that remains is to "spit" something about "murderous physicians" and it can be considered that parliamentary journalism [publitsistika] has fallen to the level of Stalin's times. And all for the sake of defeating the "enemy"—the authors of the presidential draft Constitution.

Even if the members of the Constitutional Commission and the Working Commission To Modify the Draft Constitution do agree on something, according to the logic of advocates of adopting the Fundamental Law through the notorious "constitutional channel," long since dried up, the prepared constitutional "product" will nevertheless have to get through the Congress. And the highest forum of legislative power would rather dissolve itself than ever adopt a Constitution other than the "Soviet" one. And it has to be suggested that the "Rumyantsev" draft has no chance of being adopted in this way either.

The constitutional field is riddled with mines at every turn. While the Congress exists, this field cannot be cleared because there is no separation of powers in the country. First it is necessary to establish a system corresponding to this fundamentally democratic principle, and only then to discuss details regarding "the checks and balances."

Democrats Divided Over Procedures To Adopt Constitution

MK1905115693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 11

[Mariya Zasurskaya commentary published in the "Around the Constitution" column: "Debates on Constitution Intensify Split Within Regions and Among Democrats"]

[Text] A regularly scheduled session of the "roundtable" of public and political movements, organizations, and parties, which is due to come out with a package of proposals for the adoption of the new constitution by 31 May, took place yesterday in the House of Unions. Representatives of Democratic Russia are not taking part in the work of this forum, while other radical democrats are. Thus, the debates about the constitution have caused a split also within the camp of the president's supporters.

Concerning the "roundtable," a session of Democratic Russia's Coordinating Council stated that such a conference, laying claim to becoming a component part of the constitutional conference, is grossly illegitimate, and that participation in it is unacceptable for any serious political organization. "We must reject all these quotas for the representation of particular parties" said Vladimir Bokser. "They are based on the assumption that there are right, left, and centrist forces. In fact there are two forces: the party of the victors and the party of the losers. At any rate we must have much greater representation than any other bloc."

Bokser also told a routine session of the Public Committee of Russian Democratic Organizations that took place the day before yesterday that any party getting involved with these quotas will be a political corpse in the next elections. Democratic Russia threatened that it might withdraw from the committee unless it advocated the constitution's being adopted by constituent assembly or referendum. Not all the participants in the public committee, however, share Democratic Russia's position. Telman Gdlyan, leader of the New Russia bloc, suggested that there was "no need to adopt a pose" and that all of the president's efforts be supported, including the creation of a constitutional assembly. Representatives of this bloc did not refuse to participate in the "roundtable."

Meanwhile, within Democratic Russia itself a special position was declared by the Republican Party's Political Council, which favors the constitution's being adopted by a newly composed parliament elected on a multiparty basis not later than spring 1994. This is due to the fact, the political council maintains in its statement, that "in the current situation neither the presidential nor the congressional draft constitution has a legitimate juridical or political mechanism for adoption." In the republicans' opinion, it is necessary now to adopt a constitutional law for the transition period.

As for the roundtable itself, those present at yesterday's conference in the House of Unions had some doubts as to whether to take part in the work of the constitutional conference summoned only at the president's decision, without coordination with all the branches of power. The participants decided to discuss this problem only after all of the 176 invited representatives of political organizations have sat down at the roundtable. Given the position of Democratic Russia, however, the chances of the conference's getting together in its full composition are virtually nil. Nonetheless, in the near future the roundtable will open a discussion on the mechanisms for adopting the constitution and on its main provisions, and by 31 May it will prepare a draft package of its proposals.

KOMMERSANT-DAILY will report on the results of the work of this forum in its 1 June issue.

Observer Comments on 'Constitutional Crisis'

LD1905184393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1733 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS observer Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, May 19 TASS—The events in political life of Russia are developing with great acceleration. A month ago, many observers associated their hopes for the recovery from the constitutional crisis with the referendum. Now it is clear that the Russian president decided to rely on adopting a new constitution as a means of coming out of the crisis.

The need to have a new fundamental law arose after adopting the declaration on Russia's sovereignty in the summer of 1990. This necessity became particularly vital in December 1991 after the disintegration of the Soviet Union as a state. For over two years the Constitutional Commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation have been working on a draft constitution. Actually Oleg Rumyantsev, executive secretary of the Constitutional Commission, headed its work, although formally President Boris Yeltsin was its chairman. The draft constitution was adopted by the Supreme Soviet but the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies did not pass it fully, and approved only its general concept. According to jurists, the draft was somewhat vague, and it contained the concept of Russia as a semipresidential republic.

On April 29, Chairman of the Constitutional Commission Boris Yeltsin put forward a new "presidential" draft constitution. This draft essentially changed the balance of powers in favour of the president allowing him, according to experts, broader powers than those existing in Western presidential republics.

The availability of the two drafts of the constitution—the one drawn up by the parliament and the other by the president—made relations between the two branches of power still more heated. Parliament speaker Ruslan

Khasbulatov called the president's actions "anti-constitutional". The country saw sharp disputes about whose draft was better, and about the ways of adopting a new constitution.

The president wishes to speed up its adoption. On June 5, Boris Yeltsin decided to convene a constitutional assembly—something like a round table for agreeing on the draft constitution (but not for its adoption). Boris Yeltsin issued a decree ordering to finalize the draft by June 10. It is planned that this assembly will consist of the subjects of the Federation (two people from each republic, territory and region—from executive and representative powers), representatives from deputies' factions, the parliament and the Constitutional Commission, representatives of executive power, main political parties and movements.

It would seem that the struggle between the supporters of the two constitutional drafts would be for dear life. However, more and more jurists and politicians come out for avoiding confrontation and merging the two documents. It looks like this may become a reality. President Mintimer Shaymiyev of Tatarstan spoke for this line of action. Sergey Filatov, head of the president's administration, does not exclude the possibility of "agreeing" on the two constitutional drafts on condition that the president's draft will be a basic one. Vice Premier Sergey Shakhray spoke about the president's readiness to "merge" the texts of the drafts. There is no unanimity on this issue in the parliament. Ruslan Khasbulatov and some deputies are irreconcilably against the president's initiative. Nikolay Ryabov, deputy head of parliament, supported by many parliamentarians, comes out for the participation in the work of the Constitutional Assembly.

But the greatest difficulties for the president are connected with the subjects of the Federation without whose approval the constitution cannot be adopted. Parliament leaders of a number of former autonomies sharply criticise the president's draft saying that its first section contradicts with the main ideas of the federal treaty included in the draft constitution. Representatives of authorities in a number of territories and regions believe that their rights in the social and economic sphere must be equal to those of the republics which often have the smaller territories and population.

The problem also lies in the way of adoption of the constitution. The possible variants—by a Congress of Russian People's Deputies, a referendum or by a specially convened constituent assembly—do not suit unconditionally all the sides.

In any case, if a new constitution is adopted at the time scheduled by the president, this will inevitably entail elections both of a new parliament and a new head of state.

Paper Previews 5 Jun Constitutional Conference

PM2005080193 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Dmitriy Babich article: "Is Yeltsin Threatened by a Revolt of the Regions? The 'President's' Draft Russian Constitution Will Probably Gain the Support of the Federation Members, But Only If Important Amendments Are Made To It"]

[Text] The Constitutional Conference is to assemble in Moscow on 5 June. Two representatives—one representing the executive (the president of the republic or head of the oblast administration), the other the republic supreme soviet or oblast soviet—will come from each region or republic, we were told by Vladimir Varov, member of the working party in charge of preparing the conference. For the first time in many years the fate of the laws will be decided not by the Moscow leaders but by provincial representatives. Therefore we decided not to set off as usual for the "corridors of power," but to ring around our Russian correspondents.

Out of the 18 regions and republics that we managed to contact, seven are disposed to support the president's draft; three, with greater or lesser likelihood, will oppose it; one (Chechnya) will not take part in the conference; Tatarstan will in all likelihood confine itself to sending observers; while six have not yet clearly determined their position and are currently drawing up amendments which they would like to make to the text of the Constitution.

As a rule, representatives of executive authority—the presidents of the republics and heads of administrations—support the president's draft. The supreme soviets of the republics and the oblast soviets are (albeit far from always) against. The reasons are understandable: There is no room for "soviet" power in the president's draft, although here too there are no rules without exceptions: According to our correspondents' reports, some soviets (for example, in Yekaterinburg and Vladivostok) will most likely support Yeltsin.

Thus, for example, on 17 May the leaders of the supreme soviets of the eleven republics issued a joint statement noting that the president's draft "does not include very importants norms of the Federation Treaty concerning the fact that in terms of their state-legal status the republics represent sovereign states." It is not so much the soviets' "hostility" to the president as the republics' desire to manage their own property on their own soil which lies behind this statement.

In an interview for our correspondent Marat Abuzarov, chief of the Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet press service, said inter alia that Bashkortostan would like to conclude a bilateral agreement with Moscow which allows the republic to carry out its own tax policy and autonomous foreign economic activity and clearly demarcates federal and republic property.

As our Kazan correspondent Boris Vishnevskiy reports, Tatarstan would also like to conclude a similar bilateral treaty. As presidential adviser Rafael Khakimov told him in an interview, the republic leaders "are interested in the text of the law from the standpoint of whether it allocates a separate paragraph to the statute on associate relations." Associate relations, according to the adviser, "are based on bilateral treaties on mutual delegation of powers and objects of jurisdiction [predmety vedeniy]."

Many republics thus want to live according to their own laws and manage their own property. Others demand the restoration of their rights. According to the forecasts made by Aleksandr Yevtushenko, our correspondent in Pyatigorsk, the president's draft will certainly encounter active opposition in Ingushetia, which reccently declared itself a sovereign democratic republic, and in Kabardino-Balkaria. The point here is that the Ingush and the Balkars were repressed peoples. The government has made them a lot of promises, but most have yet to be carried out.

What will be the result, then? At best a compromise between the interested parties—the president and the "members of the federation." At worst Russia will disintegrate like the Union.

New Border Law Welcomed; Concerns Expressed

PM1905085593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 May 93 p 1

[Anatoliy Stasovskiy article: "Russia's Border Is A Specific Concept. The Law on It Concerns Each of Us"]

[Text] Today we are publishing the law "On the Russian Federation State Border" which was recently adopted by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has been following the elaboration of this law since last year. The editorial office has received many letters about it, and this too shows that the law and many of the issues it covers are of interest and concern not only to those directly involved in guarding the state border—border guards, air defense troops, naval seamen, and customs officers—but to all citizens of Russia. There is a simple explanation for this: The law lays down new and more democratic norms for the border regime and the procedure for crossing the border. That is, something that each of us could encounter in our everyday lives. The interpretation in the law of the establishment of borders with the CIS states is not without interest either. I think that a wide range of readers will be familiarizing themselves with the published law.

Just what will the new law offer? When the state border is mentioned I cannot help recalling pictures from documentaries from the time of the Great Patriotic War. Many people will probably remember them—reaching the border, our soldiers raise a striped pole that they happen to have found. The men's joy and triumph seem boundless. Understandably so: They had finally liberated their native land and driven the enemy beyond its borders.

I mention this because, clearly, that is how people are—they only think about the borders of their fatherland, their fortress and its sacred inviolability when times are really hard. When their homes have been destroyed, when their fields have been trampled by an enemy. Today there is no direct threat to our sovereignty and security. But the "transparency" of the Russian Federation's borders has brought the state and all Russian citizens so much concern, worry, and unpleasantness, that the question of adopting a law on the border has taken on paramount importance. No wonder: We have been getting drugs, counterfeit money, and weapons in return for the many tonnes and cubic meters of oil, metals, timber, and jewels smuggled out of Russia...

Smuggling is particularly widespread in the expanses of the former Union. It would be no mistake to say that many people have a picture in their minds of a pitch-black night, long rows of barbed wire, and creeping shadows loaded up with prohibited goods. In actual fact many valuables have left and are still leaving Russia in tens and hundreds of trucks, railcars, and aircraft in full sight of everyone. That is the bitter truth.

And one more point. The Baltic states, for instance, have slammed the border shut with a "customs lock" on their side. They have inspections and controls... Just try getting anything valuable out, but getting something in is another matter. You have a green light for that.

Yet it is only now that we are "closing" the border there. We decided only recently to bring in visas. There is now a law to provide a legal basis for the border guards' actions. People had gotten the impression that we were confident that our wealth and resources were inexhaustible and that, however much was taken out of the country, it could never all be taken out. It happens that even Russia's granaries, to use the old phrase, are not bottomless.

So the law has been passed and has come into force, and we can probably draw breath. But there is still something not quite right. Something worrying. Out of almost 61,000 km of Russian border more than 13,500 km have not as of now been formalized to meet the requirements of the international legal system and have no corresponding infrastructure. What does this show? It shows that sooner or later we will have to close those sections of the border (with certain states it would be desirable to do this as soon as possible). This may seem simple to some—just erect "barriers" and arrange for patrols of border guard detachments... But there is also the question of social provision for the people serving on the border, the necessary training and material base, and modern engineering and technical support. And all that adds up to a lot of money. An extra 24.8 billion rubles is already been allocated from the state budget to close the borders with the Baltic and Transcaucasian states alone. But the "naked" border will cost still more.

As the law clearly states, when it comes to making arrangements for the border today a great deal depends on the local authorities. Wherever our "nearest" neighbors have already passed through, sweeping away everything right, left, and center, the local authority chiefs are more acutely aware of the importance of giving urgent help to the border guards. But there are areas which have not yet been affected by these problems. In such places it is very difficult to reach mutual understanding. There are also people who believe that money spent on establishing a normal border regime is virtually being thrown away.

It is bad that effort also has to be wasted on issuing warnings. For many years there was a popular appeal in this country to help the border guards. This applied to everyone, young and old alike. Today we could probably do with some nationwide assistance in organizing and providing facilities for border protection. And there should be no trite words about how the state's political stability and economic standing—in other words, all our prosperity—depend on this too.

Popov Fears 'Complacency' Toward Hardliners

PM1805135393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 93 First Edition p 8

[Article by Gavriil Popov, chairman of the Russian Movement For Democratic Reforms: "The Authorities Must Enforce the Mandate Received at the Referendum"]

[Text] Following the 1 May clashes, the 9 May celebration in Moscow acquired special meaning.

A crisis had been building up rapidly in the national-communist camp. That section of its leaders which promised its supporters power, posts, and privileges almost the following day—all they had to do was to make the vice president president—pushed the moderates aside. After the attempt to impeach failed, they continued to lead the way, sure of their success in the referendum thanks to the questions imposed by the Congress and their own wording. The national-communist leaders miscalculated once again. The time came to account for the failure.

In this situation, the national-communist leaders chose a policy of violent confrontation, to the point of developing it into civil war. Why? Because this is the usual policy of communists and fascists, the policy of an aggressive minority seeking to assume power over the majority. As soon as it emerges that such calculations are unrealistic in peacetime, the search begins for a situation in which chances may arise. Chaos and civil war are the most suitable circumstances. Why? Because only in conditions of general chaos and civil war do the forces of this aggressive minority increase sharply owing to the unique advantage of its leaders—their readiness to spill rivers of blood. In this they have no equals. It was within the bounds of this policy that they tried to "commemorate" 1 May, striving for the right to violate law and order at any time. And they promised to conduct this policy 9 May.

But how will 9 May be celebrated by the executive which actually won the mandate of the people's confidence? Will it continue the policy of confirming itself as a power whose edicts and directives must be carried out unquestioningly? Or, as after August 1991, will hesitation and inconsistency open the way for the advantages of the referendum results to be squandered?

Moscow was, inevitably, the focus of events. Moscow is the center of the democratic movement. It smashed the 1991 putsch. Again, in the referendum it gave Yeltsin even more votes than in the presidential election. But there is another Moscow of equal import. It has a disproportionate excess of workers from former ministries and departments, the Central Committee, and the Council of Ministers. Many pensioners of high party, military, and security service rank moved here, although there were already enough such Muscovites. Here, too, the commercial structures of the former CPSU are by far the strongest.

There is a third Moscow—the Moscow of lifelong "outsiders" [limitchiki] who have never mastered its culture. Likewise there are many purely lumpen individuals—the lumpen-proletariat, and the lumpen-intelligentsia. This milieu, raised on "rations" which were miserly but nevertheless guaranteed daily, became easy prey for the radical-communists and radical-patriots. So the choice of Moscow as a place for confrontation, for trials of strength by the bankrupt leaders of national-communism, was logical. In no other region of the country—not even in places where a majority voted for them—do the national-communists have such a firm base.

The executive's decision to compromise on 9 May was, in principle, correct. Of course it would have been wrong for millions of veterans, whose lives have not been easy anyway, to go away from their celebration feeling offended. On the whole, the formula for compromise was also sensible. Once all the slogans, banners, and other attributes of the rally on Tverskaya had been cleared way, the demonstration participants were to be allowed to go onto Red Square, like other Muscovites, for a public promenade. In turn, the executive authority accepted the duty not to use the OMON [special purpose militia detachment] to guard Red Square.

The 9 May events showed the national-communists fail to exploit the opportunity to start laying the foundations of normal relations with the executive. Again, as on 1 May, they decided to assert their right not to deal with the administration (are they really expected to deal with an "occupying power"?), and their right to do as they please (at the current stage, this means "for now" the right "merely" to expose "peacefully" a legally elected president, standing on Red Square right underneath the window of his office!). The matter centered on a three-way mockery—of the president's Edict on Red Square, of the Moscow Government's decision, and of personal promises and commitments.

Did the executive know about the imminent breakdown of the agreement? If—as on 1 May—it did not know, then any normal person would ask the following question: Why does Russia have a Security Ministry? What good are ears which do not hear and eyes which do not see? Indeed, could it be that the Security Ministry may be abolished, as it has been in Kalmykia, and its operational units handed over to the Ministry of Internal Affairs?

Of course I do not believe that the Security Ministry did not have the information. My telephone works even less reliably now than at the height of the struggle between the interregional forces and Gorbachev. If, indeed, it is true that the Security Ministry knew nothing, then the picture is all the gloomier for the Security Ministry. Somehow, professionals who knew but dared not report to their superiors can still be understood, but inaction or incompetence cannot be forgiven.

But even in this case, the authorities were obliged to prepare for several possible options for breaking the agreement. In the final analysis, the habits of our opposition, its customary and moral criteria have long been studied.

I see the executive's main error 9 May in the fact that it had no non-violent plan for reacting to a violation of the agreement. Let us try to rationalize this.

We really do not want to launch the OMON at demonstrators. Especially as the OMON does not have tear gas or any of the dozens of other means which have been acquired by civilization in order to avoid bloodshed while at the same time dispersing offenders. But why was it that it proved impossible to switch all the street loudspeakers on at full volume from the moment the agreement was violated and antigovernment slogans crept out—by the Moscow City Soviet building, en route to Red Square? Everybody remembers the way in which we were "drowned out" by music on Red Square 1 May 1990. Why was it not possible to warn demonstrators constantly about a repetition of 1 May through the loudspeakers? Why was it not possible to declare officially that the authorities disclaimed all responsibility for participants' safety at the demonstration? Why was it impossible to tell organizers every five minutes that material about them personally would be handed over to the Prosecutor's Office that day?

Why were the offenders excused everything? Can it really be the case that there is no halfway form of reaction between the two methods of beating people around the head or completely surrendering one's position?

The administration's error was intensified many times over by the disgraceful behavior of all television channels. The first accurate report we saw came from Britain's BBC, relayed by one of the Moscow channels. But what about our own guys? They "clipped" footage, and did everything to conceal the fact that for several hours already the demonstrators had been behaving on 9 May in the same fashion as 1 May. Television failed to make the country aware that it was only the authorities' restraint which "robbed" the demonstrators of the punishment warranted.

Television channels should have started live coverage immediately. They had a duty hour by hour to show the whole country the face of the offenders—all their slogans and battle cries. So that all veterans might see that, on this their holiday, they remained for the national-communists the very same cannon fodder as they had been throughout the entire war.

Once the commentaries began, the whole thing became quite shameful. This is what we heard on "Vesti": "The authorities have allowed...". Instead of this: "The authorities did not permit anything, the authorities magnanimously refrained from using force against the offenders, although this would have been legitimate." Here is another commentary: "The veterans did not admit..." Why lie? What did the veterans have to do with it? Or take this commentary: Everything was "peaceful." If calls on Red Square to do away with the legitimate president are considered "peaceful," then this is precisely the version of "peaceful" development that the national-communists dream about. This was from "Vesti." It is not worth mentioning "Ostankino" or "Moscow Channel": Here they featured "100,000 participants," "the most powerful antigovernment demonstration," and other gems.

Only Ye. Kiselev on "Itogi" tried to save the professional face of Russian television journalism. The painful impression is being created that our television tried to conceal the point of the demonstration, and to remain silent about the fact that "peace" was bought at the price of yet another concession to the national-communists.

As for the authorities, they should have published an official statement immediately in connection with the course of the demonstration. Instead of this, the authorities stayed silent. In general, the executive again "ceded" positions to the national-communists by failing to find an appropriate reaction and by trying to conceal from the country the scale and nature of their onslaught.

What would the millions of ordinary citizens say to this "surrender"?

They were called to the referendum: Help the authorities, they want reform. And they went.

They were promised: Approve the president and his policy, and he will help to deepen the reforms. They cast their votes, and they approved.

Now the situation is this: The citizen says: I did everything you asked; now it is time for you to act. But two weeks have already passed, and rumors prevail.

The authorities wanted to deliver a rebuff 1 May, but they did not succeed in doing so. It is shameful, but understandable: They want to do something, but they do not yet know how.

But there can be no explanations for 9 May: Not only do the authorities not know how but, it would seem, they do not want to enforce the mandate won at the referendum.

Of course, one error is no basis for a tragedy. But the democratic forces and all advocates of a peaceful, lawful, constitutional path for emerging from the crisis must overcome complacency. Otherwise 25 April 1993 will become a second edition of August 1991.

Economic Issues

Further on Industrialist, Government Conference

MK1905111093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 3

[Nikolay Podlipskiy report published in the "Conference of Industrial Generals" column: "Industrialists Help Boris Fedorov Justify the Need for Tough Financial Policy"]

[Text] The Russian Government has now displayed a hitherto unknown ability to listen to the opinion of representatives of industrial circles in the process of elaborating its economic course, before and not after making major decisions. This was borne out by yesterday's conference in Staraya Ploshchad by Vice Premiers Boris Fedorov and Anatoliy Chubays with the directors of enterprises that have performed best in the conditions of economic reform. The cabinet members' readiness for dialogue with the industrialists also appears quite justified from a political point of view.

The Russian Government's practice incorporates more or less frequent consultations with representatives of the opposition and industrial circles. Up until now, however, meetings of this kind have been held only after the government has made major decisions. Therefore yesterday's conference is of unquestionable interest because the government has virtually for the first time decided to first hear out representatives of leading industrial enterprises and then, taking their opinion into account, start adjusting its economic course.

The idea of holding such a conference belongs to Boris Fedorov and Valeriy Babkin, leader of the deputies faction Commodity Producers for Reform. After the Eighth Congress the Finance Ministry worked out criteria for referring enterprises to the category of those "successfully operating in the conditions of economic reform." According to Babkin, these include enterprises whose economic performance has not deteriorated during the conduct of reform, who have expanded their presence in the domestic and foreign markets, and who have maintained their social infrastructure. In addition, another obligatory requirement is for an enterprise to abandon the use of easy state credits in its activity. According to the faction's estimates, there are not more than 300 enterprises in Russia that fully meet these demands. The leaders of 47 of them (representing 37 regions in Russia) were invited to take part in this conference.

Thus, restricting participation in the conference to managers of thriving (naturally, against the general Russia-wide backdrop) enterprises takes on a pronounced political dimension. Indeed, the confirmation of the idea that enterprises can survive in conditions of fairly tough monetary policy could play a substantial role in helping Fedorov vindicate the need for pursuing such a policy in the future as well. And this is becoming especially important in the run-up to the signing by the Council of Ministers and the Central Bank of an agreement on coordinated conduct of tough financial policy, whose urgency has to be proven not only to Viktor Gerashchenko, but also to many members of the government.

Another important consequence of this conference could be a final definition of the government's tactics vis a vis the industrial circles—divide and conquer. Its main provision will be the mandatory consideration (within the government's jurisdiction) of the demands by those industrialists who support the cabinet, and the provision of most favored treatment in the granting of various benefits to the enterprises whose leaders have demonstrated the most loyalty during the period of political instability.

[Article contains following boxed passage]

In order to improve the industrial management system the leaders of major enterprises deem it necessary to:

—work out nationwide programs for industrial development (overall, about 10 large-scale programs);

—ensure clear-cut coordination of the activity of the Economic and Finance Ministries with a view to their possible merger:

—upgrade the banking settlement system in order to accelerate payments;

—upgrade legislation on foreign investments to attract foreign exchange resources;

— work out an effective system of protectionism for Russia's industrial enterprises;

—regulate the level of wages, accompanied by their simultaneous unification by economic branch;

—rigidly link wages to increases in production volumes;

—improve the system of setting prices for electrical energy with a possible unification of tariffs with regard to enlarged regions or Russia as a whole;

—ensure the speediest possible adoption of a law on trusts.

Fedorov Comments on Finance Ministry Reform Course

MK1905114093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Olga Krushelnitskaya report under the rubric "Reforms": "Does the IMF Trust Us? The Granting to Russia of Necessary Funds Depends on It"]

[Text] Whether this country gets a preferential IMF credit of $3 billion for six years will be known on 20 May. All will depend on whether the Russian Central Bank signs, together with the government, a statement confirming readiness for reforms. This was made known at a press conference by Boris Fedorov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, finance minister of the Russian Federation. Doubtless, he noted, $3 billion is not a sum that is going to salvage the reforms, but the money could prove a colossal impetus to it. Using the credit it would be possible to beat down inflation, to tighten the budget. "Getting into debt is bad, of course," the minister said, "but it is worse by far to produce money out of thin air and insist that everything is okay."

If all goes well, Russia will receive the first $1.5 billion by early July, and the rest in the September-October time frame. In addition to everything else, an accord between the Central Bank and the government on an economic program would mark a step toward further IMF representative credits, i.e. another $3 billion.

The minister observed that much has already been done for financial stabilization. In particular, credit in the second quarter was curtailed to such an extent that proposed expenditures will have to be trimmed to between 30 to 40 percent of what was planned. The Ministry of Finance will follow this policy until the end of the year. Among other priority matters the minister named further liberalization of foreign trade. It is obvious, he said, that continued insistence on export quotas would make it impossible to arrive at normal development of trade and normal prices. This also effects the hard currency exchange rate which is supposed to be based on a developed currency market. A stable rate of exchange can only be achieved via regulation and support.

Boris Fedorov stressed that he welcomes the introduction by the former USSR republics of their own currencies because the foreign states are supposed to become fully sovereign—which, however, does not rule out cooperation between them, economic cooperation included.

Russia's steps along the road of reforms boost confidence in us on the part of the G-7 industrialized countries. A decision has already been made to cut back on import subsidies. In the realm of budget policy, expenditures are being slashed despite the pressures of departmental resistance. And privatization is moving ahead after all, even if not in the best possible manner.

Central Bank Chairman on Inflation Control Measures

MK1905110093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Oleg Polukeyev commentary under "Government" rubric: "Bankers Depend on Politicians. And Gerashchenko Likes Those Whose Capital Exceeds 500 Billion Rubles"]

[Text] The extent of the damage caused by the referendum is already known. Representatives of leading entrepreneurial structures in the Russian Federation who gathered yesterday in the Column Hall of the House of Unions for the third congress of the Association of Commercial Banks excitedly discussed the latest round of "pork barrel spending promises." The president's victory has cost the country's economy a sharp jump in "easy" allocations (14 trillion rubles). Another couple of measures of this sort and Russian inflation will make it into all future textbooks as a curious phenomenon little understood by posterity.

What does the Central Bank have to offer in the face of such circumstances? The Central Bank chairman expressed his considerations on this score. According to his information—and it should be trusted—inflation in the first quarter amounted to 23 percent. There is an intention to reduce it to 20 percent in the second quarter. There are plans not to increase the rate of money supply growth by more than 15 percent. This, despite the fact that the Supreme Soviet has approved a shortfall between budget revenues and expenditures of 2 trillion rubles.

The Central Bank's moderately restrictive policy will continue, although credit restrictions will be tightened. In a situation where not only the prospect of further reforms but also their current progress is uncertain, the Central Bank of Russia, Viktor Gerashchenko said, is fully aware of its responsibility, preventing on one hand a slide into hyperinflation, and on the other, supporting enterprises and production, without whose stable operation we run the risk of falling into a yet greater extreme—the chaos and darkness of de-industrialization.

As is known, last December's monetary emission in the run-up to the referendum [as published] was neutralized. The situation suggests that in spite of the continuing growth of mutual nonpayments, the Central Bank should adhere to an increasingly tougher policy in extending centralized credits and continue to work toward establishing a positive interest rate. Thus far the interest rate (100 percent on Central Bank credits) is prompting the banks to hedge their own capital against inflation by nearly doubling (up to 180 percent and more) charges for credits.

This is no surprise: Russian banks have limited long-term credits and investments, a volume of a mere 4 percent. This is why the Central Bank intends to pursue a policy of consistent support for large banks (only one

Russian bank in five has statutory capital of 100 million rubles or more) and also to create a special network of investment banks.

Meanwhile the activity of all Russian banks is growing. How could it possibly be otherwise? The Central Bank has no other option but to intensify oversight: After all, our bankers are venturesome, hot-blooded people. Over 60 percent of banks in the Russian Federation have violated their directive economic targets. This will only be somewhat restrained by the Central Bank's intended switchover to credit auctions, but even more so by speeding up processing of documents within the system of financial settlement and clearing centers. The only question is, is it necessary to hurry? From 1 December through April the Central Bank prevented misappropriations worth 500 billion rubles. Will such things not increase after the introduction of electronic payment procedures?...

Gerashchenko merely mentioned the prerequisites for stabilizing the rate of the ruble against world currencies. What more could he have possibly said, since currency control and regulation are virtually nonexistent in our country....

Government Dilemma on Budget Deficit Viewed

PM1905115593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 18 May 93 p 1

[Yuriy Rytov report under the "In the Government" rubric: "We Will Have To Think About That One, Guys, the Prime Minister Has Stated, Convinced That There Are Plenty of Plans but Very Little Money"]

[Text] The words cited in the headline were spoken by Viktor Chernomyrdin 13 May at a session of the Council of Ministers Presidium, which once again discussed a restructuring plan. Our newspaper has already given an account of this session (see the 14 May issue of ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI). Therefore I only have to remind readers that the plan was sent off for further work owing to the abundance of programs it included and the absence of any realistic sources for financing it.

But the main point is certainly not that the session ended without any tangible results. It again forcefully identified two sets of mutually exclusive economic problems which the guys now have to think about quite hard.

The first set of problems is connected with increasing production (including and by means of restructuring) and social protection of the population.

The second set of problems is concerned with stabilizing the ruble and cutting the budget deficit.

It is not hard to see that by investing funds not backed up by goods in tackling the first group of problems, we give a further twist to the inflationary spiral. And on the other hand, by squeezing the budget, we basically deprive production and the social sphere of budgetary appropriations.

As far as the budget is concerned, the results of the first four months have provided some grounds for optimism. Yes, during this entire period the economy has been functioning in conditions of very high inflation. Between January and April inflation amounted to 220-230 percent in the consumer sector. However, specialists could not fail to notice the consistent slowing down of the rate of inflation. Thus between January and April the consumer prices index fell from 127 to 117 percent. And in April a weekly drop in the inflation rate from 6 percent in the first week to 2.8 percent in the last was noted.

The rigid framework of credit emission has also contributed to the slowing down of inflation to a considerable extent. Under an agreement between the government and the Russian Federation Central Bank, the increase in centralized loans in the second quarter has been limited to 30 percent, in the third quarter to 20 percent, and in the fourth quarter to 15 percent.

At the same time independent experts note that the danger of an inflationary explosion still exists. According to their assessment, the budget deficit could reach the 7 trillion ruble [R] mark by the end of the current quarter because of the recent increase in wages, pensions, and other social payments. After all, other important cabinet decisions designed to strengthen social programs are also in the pipeline. For example the formulation of a minimum living standard and an employment program for the population. These measures, of course, will require additional appropriations.

Ultimately, after a month or two, the government will again have to investigate the restructuring of industry (the government itself has outlined this timeframe). And even if the number of federal programs is cut, each of them will require enormous appropriations nonetheless.

There is one other factor that worries sensible economists. Right now the Central Bank of Russia has opened credit lines worth a total of R4.8 trillion. However, repaid loans total just R400 billion. Put simply, this means "borrowing without repaying" and will inevitably lead to ruin for the creditor.

Finally, there is this alarming fact. The clash between the executive and legislative branches of power is continuing in the financial sphere. On 14 May, parliament reexamined and ratified the law on the 1993 Russian Federation republic budget after it had been sent back to the Supreme Soviet by the president.

Most of the amendments proposed by Boris Yeltsin were rejected. In particular, the amendment on increasing the sum of the state debt from R10 trillion to R13 trillion.

Thus total budget expenditure and income remain unchanged. Expenditure stands at R18.7061 trillion. Income at R10.2018 trillion. The budget deficit stands at R7.2163 trillion.

It was noted, however, that the budget deficit could now exceed the ceiling set by parliament for the year.

So how can stabilization of finances be combined with strengthening the social sphere and implementing production programs? How can a balance, at least a shaky one, be achieved between the two sets of mutually exclusive problems?

We will have to think about that one, guys.

Slowing of Overall Food Price Rises Registered

PM1805150193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition p 6

[Report by Gennadiy Bortsov, staffer at Russian State Committee for Statistics: "Inflation Will Not Empty Our Pockets Yet"]

[Text] This year has seen no fundamental change to the overall dynamic of consumer goods prices. In the first quarter they increased by 90 percent—which is, admittedly, less than in the first quarter of last year.

It seems that foodstuff price levels are slowly reaching their zenith. At any rate, since the start of the year there has been a tendency for the rise to slow. Whereas in January they increased by 31 percent, the increase was 27 percent in February, 21 percent in March, and 17 percent in April. And in the period 21 April through 11 May—that, is two weeks—prices increased by 6.7 percent on average. This figure includes rises of 10 percent for meat products, 4.4 percent for dairy products, 2.7 percent for bakery products, and 5.5 percent for vegetables and potatoes.

Average store prices for basic foodstuffs had reached the following levels as of 11 May: beef 677 rubles [R], milk R66, potatoes R48, premium wholewheat bread R65.5 per kilogram, and eggs R213 for 10. But foodstuffs continued to be more expensive at markets than in the stores. For instance, beef cost R1,268, milk R117, potatoes R65, and eggs R260. There continue to be large price differentials for the same products in stores in different Russian cities. Thus, vegetable oil was selling for R150 in Ulyanovsk and R1,020 in Salekhard; milk cost R6 in Taganrog and Volgodonsk, but R204 in Vladivostok; fresh cabbage cost R16 in Ulyanovsk and R227 in St. Petersburg; while apples cost R80 in Saratov but R500 in Irkutsk.

We are into the last month of spring. Early vegetables are appearing on dacha plots and in truck gardens. They too are a good support for the family budget.

Concerns Voiced on 'Superministry's' Role

PM2005113193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition p 2

[Irina Demchenko article: "Ministry of the Economy Intends To Supplant Government, and President Too in Long Term"]

[Text] Last week the draft Edict "On the Russian Federation Ministry of the Economy" sent by Oleg Lobov, Russian Government first vice premier and minister of the economy, to his Council of Ministers colleagues, became public property. Symptoms indicating that the federal organs of power are yearning for a return to a centralized, planned, state-regulated economy, of which IZVESTIYA has repeatedly warned, were manifested as a clinical syndrome in this document.

The Russian president's draft edict defines the Ministry of the Economy as simultaneously the leading and central organ of federal executive power, which in place of the government considers "all major questions associated with planning and forecasting for Russia's socioeconomic development and its national economic complexes and regions; formulating and implementing federal, intersector, and interregional programs; elaborating and implementing a state structural, price, antimonopoly, investment, and foreign economic policy; providing the national economy and the population with basic goods and services; and implementing economic reform and the privatization of the most important sectors, production facilities, and state enterprises." All these questions can be submitted to the government only after discussion in the Ministry of the Economy, which sees its main task as "to steadfastly put into effect the policy of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government."

Under the plan set out in detail in the draft edict, the Ministry of the Economy led by Lobov, former secretary of Sverdlovsk Oblast Party Committee, (and B. Yeltsin, former first deputy secretary of the same oblast committee), assumes practically all the functions not just of the former State Planning Committee, as IZVESTIYA feared, but of the entire Council of Ministers. In principle with such a ministry the government is no longer needed, except to decide "minor" and "unimportant" questions. The minister of the economy proposes to have 15 deputies, including four first deputies. It is proposed that the first deputies be equivalent to ministers, and deputies to first deputy ministers of other ministries deciding "minor" and "unimportant" questions, while the document is tactfully silent about the minister of the economy's status equivalent. This is understandable: Lobov will not be signing edicts for a while yet.

In sum the Ministry of the Economy, jointly with other central economic organs and subjects of the Federation, is tasked with preparing draft normative acts "to create an integrated, effective, and flexible system of forms and methods of exerting state influence on the economy." Obviously it must be clear not only to us but also to

Lobov—and for natural autobiographical reasons even sooner to him than to many others—that the most integrated and perfect such system was the Communist Party which grew together with the state and that it is simply impossible to conceive anything better.

The appearance of such a cynically frank document in the second year of the official implementation of Russian market reform testifies above all to the poor results of reform itself. Lobov has at least directly answered the traditional question asked by potential foreign investors and embassy personnel: Is reform already irreversible? It is now clear that, until the national economy has accumulated the necessary "critical mass" of structural and institutional transformations, and until genuine private ownership rather than various imitations of it has started to prevail, the market in Russia is more of an object of political will than an economic reality. Many leaders of enterprises which have been privatized, leasehold, or private from inception are sure that everything in Russia can be "shut down" any day or any minute. Effectively this means that the transition to market mechanisms for regulating the economy has not taken place. Or in other words: Market methods of regulation have not started working, because we still lack a market-type, competitive environment mainly based on private ownership.

In conditions whereby 70 percent of the economy and in practice 90 percent by definition either belongs to the state or is state-dependent, the desire of the federal executive branch leadership to turn to methods of state regulation is absolutely inevitable and in a certain sense even natural. Even if it lacks what is needed, it has to get out of the situation somehow. Hence the idea belonging to the then-Gaydar government of selective support for individual enterprises within certain sectors (working mainly for final demand or export), hence the desire of Viktor Chernomyrdin, current head of the Russian Government, for state regulation of prices and partial restoration of administrative management in "socially important" sectors, and hence such a strong executive hierarchy in the presidential draft for a new constitution. Of course, all this is not the "pure" market which was elevated to the level of official ideology last year. Rather, it constitutes attempts to form a model for managing a "regulated transition" to the market for an economy which at the moment remains mainly a state economy.

However, in the state organs' natural desire for guardianship and control of state industry, the forms in which and the degree to which they intend to do this are of primary importance. State control over prices for oil and oil products is one thing, attempts to restore administrative regulation of prices in the consumer sector are quite another. State regulation of credit policy using prices for centralized credits is one thing, the release of preferential credits to machine building enterprises via the Ministry of Finance is another; a tax on the wages fund is one thing, a law on "regulating" wages is another. In this context many actions by leaders of federal organs of power and of the Central Bank of Russia are cause for suspicion: They are quite capable of leading to a partial restoration of administrative management of the economy and of really damping down entrepreneurial activity wherever it is already manifest.

If seen from this viewpoint the document circulated by First Vice Premier and Economy Minister Lobov is even useful. It details with such odious seriousness how this federal department plans to carry out the "preparation and implementation of measures of state regulation of the development of the country's economy as a whole and of its sectors and regions"; it is so absurd and pretentious in content and unthinkable in essence; it shows, what is for these times ridiculous, such concern over length of service bonuses and salary supplements, over providing medical and consumer services for the superministry's leading staff, and even over the allocation in Moscow "annually, starting in 1993, of 2,000 or 1,000 square meters of living space respectively to improve the living conditions of ministry people on the waiting list"; that in itself the ideology of returning to the tight administrative control proclaimed in the document can also be viewed as something indecent, as a subject of ridicule, and as an anecdote about our recent past rather than as a real proposal or, especially, a forecast of the future. There are things which seem so ridiculous that they make you laugh.

However, while the draft edict is being discussed in the Council of Ministers lobbies, Lobov has already started to form the ministry's leadership in accordance with the official timetable set out in it. The first deputy posts have been filled by people who worked in the former USSR State Planning Committee. Maybe he does not have a sense of humor?

Military Issues

More on Grachev on Army Reform, Constitution

PM1905095193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Aleksandr Pelts report: "Military Doctrine Aimed at Qualitative Change in Army"]

[Text] As KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has reported, Army General Pavel Grachev, Russian Federation defense minister, held a routine meeting with journalists from central publications 17 May. He answered numerous questions on important aspects of the present-day life and activities of the Russian Army. Touching on the results of work for the year, the general stated that, despite the complexity of Army reform, the conclusion can be drawn that: "Servicemen are wearing their uniforms with pride once again."

In general the defense minister's discussion could be split into several tactical problems.

Reform in the Army Should Not Be 'Shock' Therapy

This was not the first time that the defense minister had addressed journalists on this difficult problem—reform of the Russian Army. Nonetheless, questions kept coming up again: It was said that reform in the Army was not visible, that everything was proceeding at its own pace and not as it should, and that the process had clearly gotten bogged down.

In particular, the journalists at the 17 May meeting were interested in the question of a new military doctrine. Answering this point, Pavel Grachev stressed that the bulk and most labor-intensive part of the work on the doctrine is over. Its main provisions have been elaborated and comprise three sections—a military-political section, a military section proper, and a military-technical section. This important document will have to be ratified by the Security Council.

Describing the draft military doctrine, the defense minister noted that it is aimed above all at qualitatively changing the Army. To this end, a new plan has been elaborated governing the use of all branches of service of the Armed Forces and of the strategic nuclear forces, and the composition of new groupings of troops and the procedure for their deployment has been defined.

It is well known that Army reforms are linked to considerable cuts in the Army. Russia needs a small but highly professional and excellently equipped army. Its downsizing and reequipping is already under way. And, the defense minister stressed, it is very important to observe social guarantees for servicemen. This is necessary above all in order to preserve stability in the Army and create normal conditions for the implementation of complex and often painful reforms.

In Order To Achieve Peace in Nagorno-Karabakh, the Warring Factions Must Stop Pointing the Finger at Each Other

During the Russian defense minister's recent visit to Turkey the problems of a peaceful settlement of the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict were touched upon. Stressing the unshakability of Russia's position of achieving peace by political methods alone, Pavel Grachev said that this requires above all the ending of mutual accusations of aggression. The situation is complex and has gone far enough. Both sides have plenty of grounds for accusations.

Also stated was the position on the Azerbaijani side's death sentence on five Russian servicemen who deserted from a Spetsnaz brigade and had been fighting in Nagorno-Karabakh. There were eight of them in all. Two were killed earlier, and one is missing in action, but five were captured. The general reported that there had been repeated appeals for these men to be handed over to Russian law-enforcement organs, but there has still been no response from Azerbaijan. Pavel Grachev did not rule out the possibility of new attempts by the Russian side to be party to the captives' fate.

Our Troops in Georgia Temporarily If There Are No New Agreements

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already reported the meeting in Moscow between the Russian defense minister and the new Georgian defense minister—Brigade General Georgiy Karkarashvili. Pavel Grachev also announced at the news conference that, during their discussion, the Russian side had made certain fundamental provisions with regard to the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict and the presence in Abkhazia of the 345th Russian Paratroop Regiment. The Russian Federation defense minister noted above all the impermissibility of attacks by military formations, including those termed "free-lance" [neuchtennyy], on Russian servicemen. He confirmed that our troops are on Georgian territory temporarily—until 1995, if no new agreement is reached.

As Pavel Grachev put it, the meeting with the new Georgian defense minister was more of a get-to-know-you session. "We exchanged views and reached certain verbal agreements. There were no new fundamental proposals from the Georgian side," he stressed.

Draft New Constitution

As is well known, there has been an upsurge of rumors among journalists in connection with articles that have appeared claiming that the Russian Defense Ministry opposes the president's draft new constitution. Pavel Grachev assessed this as more disinformation. He explained that, on the president's instructions, all departments are currently studying the draft constitution, and comments on the draft must be submitted by 20 May.

The Defense Ministry will be making its proposals too. The draft takes objective and adequate account of defense and security issues, Pavel Grachev believes, but it seems expedient to have an independent chapter entitled "Defense of the Fatherland" in the constitution. It should particularly emphasize that the defense of the fatherland is one of the state's most important functions and is the duty of all Russian Federation citizens. It is also proposed that it enshrine the state's responsibility for the country's defense capability and for equipping the Russian Army with everything it needs, and that amendments be made to Article 76, which should regulate more fully the powers of the Russian president in the event of outside aggression. In short, we are talking about amendments rather than the Russian Federation Defense Ministry's rejecting the draft.

Supervision of Nuclear Shipment, Destruction Questioned

PM1905112793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 16 May 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast: Report by A. Peslyak]

[Text] [Peslyak] Is disarmament safe to the health? The State Committee for the Supervision of Nuclear and Radiation Safety has acknowledged that access to Ministry of Defense nuclear installations on land and sea is made extremely difficult. The nuclear weapons complex is obsessed with keeping people out and maintaining frequently unjustified secrecy. Hence the drama of Tomsk, with its losses estimated at 150 billion rubles. The absence of reliable supervision of the transportation of warheads to the destruction sites and the lack of large-capacity burial sites and dumps demonstrate that our military nuclear physicists are seriously unprepared for the massive work involved in implementing the START I AND START II Treaties. And so, as journalists, we ask the Ministry of Atomic Energy and the Ministry of Defense, and Ministers Mikhaylov and Grachev: What proportion of the credits granted for nuclear disarmament is being allocated to public extradepartmental supervision, how are scientists and psychologists working with the population in places where the terrible weapons are stored and destroyed—and what is being done in general to convince Russians that the destruction of the lethal nuclear and chemical weapons is safe for our forests, fields, and rivers? So people can breathe easy.

Council for Defense, Foreign Policy Profiled

MK1905121693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 4

[Sergey Muravev report: "Entrepreneurs' Visit to Germany. Effective Cooperation Should Be Ensured Through State Guarantees"]

[Excerpts] Late on the evening of 17 May, members of the Council for Defense and Foreign Policy returned to Moscow from a visit to Germany. Among them were well-known Russian entrepreneurs, politicians, and public figures. During the visit, the participants held a number of meetings with high-ranking officials from the German Government and sized up the state of economic cooperation between the two countries. [passage omitted]

The large number (more than half) of business people in the Russian delegation was explained by one of its members, Konstantin Zatulin, coordinator of the coalition Entrepreneurial Political Initiative, as follows: "Entrepreneurs are getting increasingly involved in the decisionmaking process, and politicians cannot but realize that not taking the voice of entrepreneurs into account is a very big political risk." [passage omitted]

[Article includes the following boxed text]

The Council for Defense and Foreign Policy of Russia was founded as a public organization in the summer of 1992. It is made up of Russian Vice Premier Sergey Shakhray; Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, head of the EPI-Tsentr—The Center for Economic and Political Studies; Anatoliy Adamishin, Russian first deputy foreign minister; Artur Chilingarov, adviser to the chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet; Anatoliy Dolgopyatov, cochairman of the Renewal Union; the well-known Russian entrepreneurs and members of the Entrepreneurial Political Initiative coalition, Mark Masarskiy, Konstantin Zatulin, Lev Vaynberg, and Sergey Yegorov; as well as RINAKO company President Dmitriy Sukhinenko, Russian Television and Radio President Anatoliy Lysenko, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA Chief Editor Vitaliy Tretyakov, and others. The chairman is Presidential Council member Sergey Karaganov. The council's primary objective is the expansion of economic and cultural links with other countries.

Commander Stresses Need for Contract Service

PM1905151793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Valeriy Gromak report: "Hopes Pinned on Contract Servicemen Justified"]

[Text] Having completed his inspection of the 11th Guards Army, Colonel General Vladimir Semenov, commander in chief of the Russian Federation Ground Forces, told your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent that "we can only survive by recruiting as many citizens as possible on contract," since the spring draft plan has already been undermined and the simultaneous discharge of two sets of draftees is coming in the fall.

The idea of military professionalism is supported among the troops—the commander in chief saw that for himself yet again when visiting the 11th Army. The Ground Forces today are close to fulfilling the plan to recruit 100,000 soldiers and noncommissioned officers on contract. As Colonel General Semenov put it, the Russian Defense Ministry intends to appeal to the government to recruit on contract the same number of servicemen again.

Constraints, Ineffective Programs Hamper Troop Transitions

LD1905132493 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 19 May 93

[Video report from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] A large number of troops from the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are moving to Russia. Due to severe cuts in the Army, the number of officers and warrant officers in the Army and the Navy due to be discharged may reach nearly 350,000 people, of whom only 60 to 70 percent qualify for pensions. Others will have to requalify for civilian jobs very quickly. Agencies from the ministries of Security and Interior and the recently-formed tax investigation department will be able to employ several thousand officers.

To socially integrate the ex-servicemen, the Defense Ministry has developed numerous programs. Larger cities have set up centers for retraining and professional advice for former military personnel. However, at a news conference today representatives of the military department admitted—rather self-critically—that any large-scale positive effect in this area has yet to be seen.

'Problems' of Resettling Returning Troops Viewed

PM1905111193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 15 May 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast: Report by Aleksandr Ostrovskiy and Yuriy Shipovskiy]

[Text] [Announcer] As reported earlier, the Russian Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution on additional measures to receive troops being withdrawn from other states, resettled, and provided with accommodation and other amenities on Russian Federation territory.

[Ostrovskiy] This resolution is intended to resolve the mounting problems pertaining to resettling returning troops. Increasingly, Russia has been receiving those returning from abroad as outcasts. Of 27 residential camps for servicemen only two have been built, and only five more are under construction. It would be good if available construction companies were enlisted to help the military—against advance payment, of course.

[A.V. Korovnikov, chairman of Russian Federation Supreme Soviet committee] We have not thought out adequately all the measures needed to provide our servicemen and their families with the necessary amenities. Essentially, a 500,000-strong grouping is being withdrawn. This is totally unprecedented, either in the world in general or in an army in particular.

[M.P. Burlakov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces] In two years we have brought back to Russia 20,000 homeless families of officers and petty officers. Only 2,212 apartments have been built with German money. This means that the pace of withdrawal is nine times higher than the pace of amenity provision.

[Ostrovskiy] Nonetheless, the Russian troops being withdrawn from Germany are in a better position than the servicemen being withdrawn from the Baltic states or the Transcaucasus. The German side has provided hard currency. The Western Group also has sizeable non-budgetary resources. And the servicemen themselves have money too. Naturally, oblast and kray administrations are more willing to accept prosperous people returning from more distant foreign countries that their destitute fellow-countrymen. Alas, there have already been examples of this.

Supreme Soviet

Ryabov Chooses 'All-Out Conflict' With Khasbulatov

LD1905151193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1400 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] The split within the leadership of the Russian parliament has reached its final stage. Radio Liberty has reported that Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Nikolay Ryabov has opted for an all-out conflict with Ruslan Khasbulatov. The rebellion against Khasbulatov can have far-reaching consequences, Radio Liberty commentators believe, up to convening an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies in order to remove the speaker from his post.

Hope From 'Forces of Reason'

PM1905120993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 93 First Edition p 4

[Otto Latsis article: "Constitutional Conference Has Potential To Become Genuine Roundtable"]

[Text] The ostensibly unexpected clash that took place in the Supreme Soviet toward the end of last week gives food for thought which goes beyond the confines of the question of relations between Speaker R. Khasbulatov and N. Ryabov, his deputy.

It would hardly be correct to confine ourselves here to an assessment of easily guessed likely tactical motives. It is easy to surmise that Ryabov, who previous to this followed in Khasbulatov's wake, was prompted to speak against the speaker on the question of a constitutional conference by the changed correlation of forces in the political arena following the referendum. But this is not the most important aspect of the event, especially as in the Supreme Soviet Ryabov received powerful support which deprived Khasbulatov of the opportunity of getting his decision passed. The political substance of the act, definable by what a sincere civic position should dictate, exists objectively, irrespective of personal motives. On this occasion it coincided with what personal motives possibly dictated as well.

The significance of the 14 May debate, which for the first time in a long time split the Russian parliament during discussion of how to respond to a presidential initiative, is not limited to the question of the likelihood of parliament itself changing positions under the influence of the antireformist forces' defeat in the referendum. There are grounds for raising the question of the extent to which the entire sociopolitical situation has changed. A paradoxical indicator of these changes could be that the slogans which only recently were being used by the president's political opponents, and for demagogic antireformist purposes, are now being used just in a different form of words—by his supporters, and for constructive, reformist purposes. Thus, the features of a genuine roundtable are suddenly appearing in the plans for the constitutional conference being organized by the president.

The roundtable operating hitherto—which was set up formally on a parity basis by the government and Supreme Soviet but which is in fact controlled by Khasbulatov's apparatus, and which has been vigorously packed with representatives of the neocommunist parties—was not genuinely "round" for two obvious reasons. First, political forces representing the minority (as the referendum showed) in society used the "table" to try to impose their will on the majority. Second, they tried to use it as an instrument to move the authorities away from the forces of democratic market reforms toward the forces of a thinly disguised apparatus revenge. In terms of these two determining parameters the aforementioned roundtable revealed its diametrical opposition to the roundtables employed in East European countries for the peaceful transfer of power from obsolete regimes to new, democratic forces. The constant juxtaposition (in speeches by Khasbulatov and other politicians) of the roundtable idea with the idea of a "coalition government" or "government enjoying the people's confidence" made the plan even clearer. The "coalition government" idea was proclaimed in the absence in the political arena not only of the coalition itself but also of the preconditions for its emergence: that is, in the absence of political parties which confirmed at the elections their support by a definite number of voters.

All the indications are that the constitutional conference now being prepared is acquiring the features of a genuine roundtable. It rests on the support of society's majority as demonstrated by the referendum. It aims to complete the transition from old to new political forms by preparing a new constitution and the procedure for adopting it. It has the potential to form a coalition of genuine rather than invented political forces—primarily in the person of representatives of the Federation's subjects.

However, it will become completely "round" only if it also guarantees a voice for representatives of the forces which are in the minority as a result of the referendum. They are represented most markedly in parliament. By including such representatives (including Ryabov) in the working commission for finalizing the draft constitution prior to a constitutional conference, the president has made a fairly clear political gesture. But the question remains: How will they respond to the invitation to conscientious cooperation? An important question for the whole of society, because a continuation of the dual power situation and the looming threat of this situation being taken to absurd lengths by the adoption of two parallel constitutions—all this would not bode well for the country. The 14 May Supreme Soviet debate showed that the situation is not hopeless. The forces of reason and political responsibility in parliament are capable of making a real impact. The coming days should show the extent to which voters can pin their hopes on these forces.

Proceedings of 20 May Session Reported

Law on Weapons Adopted

LD2005090593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0735 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow, 20 May—The law on weapons, adopted today at a session of the Russian Parliament, is to "regulate the circulation of weapons and ammunition for them," and will come into force on 1 September this year.

The document gives detailed classification of all types of weapon. Therefore, where the law relates to civilian weapons, the use of which has caused the most disputes in society, it means weapons "for use by citizens in self-defense, hunting, and sport." Self-defense weapons giving off gas can be pistols, revolvers, mechanical sprayers, and aerosol devices with tear gas lachrymatory irritants permitted by the Health Ministry. Weapons used in sport can be firearms, silent arms, including thrown and pneumatic weapons. The law imposes limitations on the circulation of professional and civilian weapons.

Report on Privatization

LD2005092693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0845 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—As many as 61,000 enterprises have become private property owned in Russia by April 1. As many as 15 thousand out of this number became private property in the first quarter of 1993, says a report of the Russian State Statistical Committee circulated in Parliament on Thursday [20 May].

Statistics indicate that the privatisation process has a somewhat slower pace this year than in the previous years, but is better organised. The number of large enterprises becoming private property is increasing more rapidly. Just as earlier, the scopes of the privatisation are the largest in trade, public catering and amenities. Eleven per cent of such enterprises switched to private property since the beginning of large-scale privatisation.

The percentage of enterprises that are privatised by the issuing of stocks is increasing, the report indicates. 76 per cent of all enterprises have already been sold. It is characteristic that only two per cent of joint-stock companies to become private property have sold all their shares. The total receipts from the sale of enterprises in January-March and the profits from the privatisation in 1992 made up around 86 billion roubles.

2.6 million flats became private property in Russia in January-April. This is ten times the number for the corresponding period last year. On the whole, 5.3 million flats have been privatised by April 1. This makes up 16 per cent of flats opened to privatisation.

Proposals on Draft Constitution

LD2005102993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0956 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—The Russian Parliament gave an outline approval to a decree on the procedure of registering proposals of the Federation's subjects on a draft new constitution. Most deputies voted in favour of this decision at a joint meeting of the parliamentary chambers on Thursday [20 May].

It is suggested that parliaments of the republics, councils of deputies of territories, regions, cities of federal importance and autonomies, jointly with representatives of executive bodies and with the participation of public organisations of appropriate subjects of the Federation will discuss the draft constitution drawn up by the Constitutional Commission (so-called parliamentary draft—ITAR-TASS) and refer the agreed-upon proposals and remarks to the commission.

Subjects of the Federation are also offered to delegate plenipotentiary representatives of republics, territories, regions, cities of federal importance and autonomies to complete the work on the draft constitution in the Constitutional Commission.

A parliamentary commission has been formed to refine the draft decree.

During the debate on the document, Russian Parliamentary Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov said "there exists only one draft new constitution of the Federation—the one that has been drawn up by the Constitutional Commission".

The alternative draft decree was prepared by Deputy Speaker Nikolay Ryabov was circulated among deputies, but it was not debated. It proposes that appropriate organs of the executive authorities should consider joinly with subjects of the Federation both drafts of the constitution—the presidential and the parliamentary—and should submit their remark to parliament before June 1.

In Nikolay Ryabov's draft, it is suggested that the president and parliament, together with subjects of the Federation and the Constitutional Commission should convene before June 5 a conference to prepare the single draft of the country's fundamental law.

IZVESTIYA Reports 14 May Deliberations

PM1905115993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 93 First Edition p 2

[Aleksandra Lugovskaya report: "Parliament Intends To Contest the President's Constitutional Intitiatives in the Constitutional Court"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet's appeal to the Constitutional Court questioning the legitimacy of the president's actions concerning the adoption of a new Russian Federation constitution was the key political question of the plenary session of parliament on 14 May.

The train of thought in and the logic of the hardline parliamentary opposition actions was most distinctly expressed in an impassioned speech by Deputy M. Chelnokov, who stated that "Carthage must be destroyed"—meaning a plan to carry out a preemptive strike against the Yeltsin team. He described the intention of the 200 deputies who work in the executive authority structures to resign as an attempt to prevent a quorum at the Congress and thus "declare to society that the Congress does not exist." Then, according to Chelnokov, who is noted for his predilection for seeing nothing but intrigues and plots in the presidential team's actions, the president will convene the Constitutional Assembly and impose on the people an unconstitutional means of adopting the constitution. The "ultimate aim" of the president's "perfidious scheme," Chelnokov is convinced, is the establishment of a "totalitarian monarchical regime" in Russia.

Parliament, which is used to Deputy Chelnokov's extravagant statements, resolved nevertheless to examine the question of withdrawing the mandates of the 200 deputies who combine jobs. This proposal was vigorously supported by parliamentary Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov.

Regarding the questioning of the "president's actions over the adoption of the Constitution" in the Constitutional Court, its fate had already been determined the day before in the Soviet of the Republic. Its chairman, V. Sokolov, asked parliament merely to support the chamber's decree since, under the rules, it is not empowered to lodge an appeal against the president's actions in the Constitutional Court.

Thus the Supreme Soviet is definitively deciding where its stands, and in launching the battle for the "Rumyantsev version of the constitution" will do its utmost to "muddle the cards" held by the president and wrest the constitutional initiative away from him. From this standpoint, another item featuring on the day's agenda—the confirmation of the membership of the Committee for the Mass Media—is symptomatic. The names of candidates such as V. Chikin, M. Astafyev, and G. Sayenko are being cited in the corridors of parliament—which promises to intensify the struggle on the information front.

The morning session examined the president's amendments to the Law "on the Russian Federation Republic Budget for 1993," earlier adopted by the Supreme Soviet. They were virtually all turned down. The president's proposals on granting soft loans to conversion programs and lifting the ban on financing the Federal Information Center, among others, failed to get through.

The confirmation of the Committee for the Mass Media, scheduled for the afternoon, took place at the chairman's request just before the main recess, and took ten minutes. V. Lisin reported to deputies that the new committee contained 12 professional journalists, eight of whom had worked in the committee before. They all represent different parliamentary factions, and for that reason the committee "will veer neither to the left nor the right and will implement Congress rather than party decisions."

Despite the statements made, Radical Democrats I. Zbronzhko, R. Mikailov, and S. Nosovets did not become committee members. V. Lisin explained this by saying that "for political reasons he refuses to cooperate with such commentators" who, in his opinion, have not engaged in lawmaking activity in any way. Nor did SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Editor V. Chikin get on to the committee. On the other hand, the provisional forecasts regarding M. Astafyev and G. Sayenko were borne out.

Khasbulatov's Press Secretary on Draft Constitution

LD1905165493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1626 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—Recent statements by some politicians and mass media bodies artificially stir up tension and spread various rumors to discredit the activities of the Russian Parliament heads and all deputies in connection with the discussion of a draft new Russian constitution, says a statement of Russian Parliament Speaker Press Secretary Konstantin Zlobin circulated here today.

Another attack on them was made by the latest statement of Presidential Press Secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov, which was of clearly destructive and provocative character, says the document.

It seems the attack on the representative power was caused by the fact the presidential draft constitution was negatively estimated by a large number of federation subjects, notes the statement. Eleven Russian republics, many territorial and regional councils made sufficient remarks on the document. One cannot help seeing Russian reforms are hampered by not so the constitutional crisis as drawbacks in social and economic policy of the executive power.

The Russian Supreme Soviet chairman denounces tactics of the on-going confrontation between the two power branches and sees the way out of the crisis situation in a mutually acceptable compromise on the constitutional basis with due account of interests and opinions of all federation subjects, says Zlobin.

Doubtlessly, all interested sides should make steps to achieve a constructive compromise. Otherwise, the confrontation may lead society to the most tragic consequences: There will be neither the president, nor the parliament, they will become politically non-existent.

Khasbulatov Talks With Local Officials on Constitution

LD1905135093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1337 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—An hour-and-a-half selective telephony meeting held this morning by Russian parliament speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov and his deputy Valentin Agafonov with heads of local councils focused on a draft new Russian constitution, head of the Supreme Soviet press service Yuriy Marechenkov reports.

The meeting involved practically all heads of republican parliaments, heads and deputies of regional, territorial, district and village councils, as well as some administration heads. Over 2,000 radio studios were used for selective telephony.

An opening speech of Khasbulatov stressed "the main thing now is not to prepare a draft new constitution, but to analyze and boost the economic reform progress, since well-being, including that legal, of russians depends on the economic situation."

In the speaker's words, the world has not witnessed the adoption of a constitution by executive power bodies, even under dictator regimes. It could be the matter of only constitutional forms of elaboration and adoption of the fundamental law, he said.

"Both drafts should be considered in the current situation," noted the speaker, and said both drafts are presidential, as the first of them was submitted to the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies by a constitutional commission headed by Boris Yeltsin.

In the opinion of Khasbulatov, "it would be expedient for councils to take everything positive from the drafts and manage to elaborate a single draft to prevent Russia from having two constitutions."

According to Marechenkov, neither meeting speaker supported the second draft constitution. All of them said the first draft should be basically approved and further developed with due account of the second document. Councils were offered to form their delegations to improve the constitution, as it was done in the federal treaty elaboration. At that time, local representatives gathered in Moscow in the Supreme Soviet building and finalized the document later signed by federation subjects.

The speakers also proposed to take into account other drafts currently elaborated by various parties, as well as to preserve best provisions of the current constitution.

When discussing the constitutional conference on June 5 announced by the president, Khasbulatov said "there is no need to send representatives to the conference." In his opinion, "it is the question of their stand". No instructions to abstain from the conference were given, said Marechenkov.

He stressed "everything is being done to prevent parallel work on both drafts. The single draft should be discussed. As for work on the Constitution, it should not be done in haste. Notes of both representatives of power bodies and citizens should be taken into account. The elaboration should not be completed before fall, 1993."

Supreme Soviet Requests Ruling From Constitutional Court

LD1905120693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1121 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 19 May—The Constitutional Court today received a submission from the Supreme Soviet requesting that it rule on the constitutionality of the president's actions with regard to the procedure for adopting a new Basic Law. This was reported to the ITAR-TASS correspondent by Sergey Obukhov, press secretary of the Constitutional Court.

As has already been reported, the Supreme Soviet made this decision last week. Deputies voted in favor of it after numerous comments by Ruslan Khasbulatov on the "unconstitutionality" of Boris Yeltsin's actions with regard to his work on the president's draft of the basic law, which has become an alternative to the one on which the Russian Constitutional Commission has been working for the last two years. The delay in delivering the submission to the Constitutional Court could be explained by the fact that the Supreme Soviet chambers had made the decision "from voice," but several days were necessary to compile a written document.

According to experts, the submission of the Supreme Soviet "is doomed," because the president has the right to convene various advisory assemblies such as the proposed Constitutional Assembly scheduled for 5 June.

Economic Reform Commission Chairman Elected

LD1905092193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0807 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow, 19 May—A 37-year-old candidate of juridical sciences, Vladimir Mazayev, deputy chairman of the highest economic council of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, member of the Committee on Legislation, and a member of the Change-New Policy faction, was elected chairman of the Economic Reform Commission of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet today. The Commission was created last week, replacing the parliamentary committee on issues of economic reform and ownership, formerly led by democrat Sergey Krasavchenko. The decision to reorganize the committee, which had been repeatedly criticized for the course of the economic reforms and "insufficient" legislative activity, was taken at a Supreme Soviet sitting at the end of April during a review of the work of the Russian Federation State Committee for the Management of State Property.

At that time, activities of the state committee were deemed unsatisfactory. A number of deputies believe the work of the parliamentary committee was criticized due to the reformist stance of its head and a majority of the committee members. Today's sitting has decided to establish the composition of this commission of the chamber within a week.

Paper Notes Former Affiliations of Media Aides

PM1905154993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Who Now Supervises the Press in Parliament?"]

[Text] The first organizational session of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Committee on the Media, elected the other day, was held Monday [17 May]. Nikolay Ogorodnikov and Viktor Yugin were elected deputy chairmen.

The session also elected the leaders of the four subcommittees. The subcommittee on the press is headed by Igor Yeremin, who was deputy chairman of the previous committee before it was disbanded. Mikhail Astafyev, one of the leaders of the "Russian Unity" faction and National Salvation Front opposition bloc, is chairman of the subcommittee to monitor implementation of legislation on the media. The subcommittee on radio and television is headed by Viktor Beketov, former political observer for Central Television of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. The subcommittee on publishing houses and the book trade is headed by Nail Aminov. Before being elected people's deputy he was Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] minister of housing and utilities.

A council to oversee the activities of the electronic media is expected to be formed in the very near future under the media committee. According to INTERFAX data, it will most likely be headed by Oleg Plotnikov, one of the leaders of the "Smena-New Policy" faction.

Supreme Soviet Asks Azerbaijan for Extradition

PM1905152793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Humanitarian Act of Goodwill"]

[Text] While showing profound respect for the sovereign Republic of Azerbaijan and its highest organs of power and its judiciary, the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet has requested the Republic of Azerbaijan president and National Assembly to hand over to Russian justice former servicemen from the USSR Armed Forces Yaroslav Leonidovich Yevstigneyev, Vladislav Petrovich Kudinov, Mikhail Stepanovich Lisovyy, Vladimir Nikolayevich Semion, Konstantin Vladimirovich Tukish, and Andrey Anatolyevich Filippov.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, the appeal stresses, reaffirms its firm adherence to UN principles condemning mercenary activity and criminal acts committed by mercenaries and gives assurances that Russia will fairly, in full accordance with international law, openly, and in an exemplary fashion organize a trial of the said Russian citizens.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet will regard the satisfaction of this request by the highest organs of the Republic of Azerbaijan as a humanitarian act of goodwill.

Regional Affairs

Chubays Visits Komi, Says Yeltsin Not To Dissolve Congress

LD1905175493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent Zuzev from Syktyvkar; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Russian Deputy Premier Anatoliy Chubays visited Syktyvkar, the capital of Komi, today. Adoption of the draft constitution is viewed by republics as not just another opportunity for solving the crisis at the center. They also have their own interests in mind. It has been repeatedly said that the presidential draft limits the rights of the subjects of the Federation.

[Begin Chubays recording] The presidential draft, as you probably know, includes the Federation treaty. Therefore, one cannot talk of any limitations here. [end recording]

At the deputy premier's meeting with members of the Supreme Soviet and Government of Komi and the heads of administration and enterprises it was stressed again that Boris Yeltsin rejects the introduction of presidential rule and the dissolution of the Congress [of People's Deputies] as unacceptable ways of overcoming the crisis.

Irkutsk Meeting Approves Yeltsin's Draft Constitution

LD2005110293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1025 GMT 20 May 93

[ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Khodiy]

[Text] Irkutsk, 20 May—The draft Basic Law proposed by the Russian president and his initiative in convening a constitutional conference have been approved in principle at a meeting of representatives of seven subjects of the Federation in the East Siberian region during discussion of the draft Russian Constitution. The meeting ended today in Irkutsk. It was attended by government Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray.

Tatarstan To Participate in Drafting Constitution

LD1905140893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1335 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Nikolai Sorokin]

[Text] Kazan May 19 TASS—Tatarstan cannot remain indifferent towards considering the constitutional drafts of the Russian Federation, president of this republic Mintimer Shaymiyev said in an exclusive interview with ITAR-TASS today.

Parliamentarians of Tatarstan included the question of considering the draft of the Russian constitution in the agenda of a session of the supreme soviet of the republic. Earlier this issue was rejected by parliamentarians on the first day of the session, May 17. A speech by Mintimer Shaymiyev, in which he supported an initiative by a group of deputies, who collected signatures in favour of participating in the elaboration of the federal constitution, became a strong factor in making this decision.

"One cannot make a big time policy sitting on one's hands," this is how the president of the republic commented on this decision. "We will take part in all the processes affecting the interests of Tatarstan. The participation in working out a constitution for the Russian Federation corresponds to the decision by the parliament of Tatarstan and proceeds from the law on bringing our constitution into force. This law stipulated the need to address the Supreme Soviet of Russia with a proposal to make provisions about treaty- constitutional relations between Russia and Tatarstan constitutional in the fundamental law of the Russian Federation. Once we have chosen a "street with two-way traffic", we have to take an active part in working out the fundamental law of the federation. I am included in the working group dealing with the elaboration of the constitution as a participant together with a number of leaders of other republics. I will consistently uphold the positions of Tatarstan and other republics on problems of a state structure of the federation and making relations between Russia and Tatarstan constitutional," Mintimer Shaymiyev pointed out.

Comparing the two constitutional drafts proposed by the Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the Supreme Soviet, the president of Tatarstan said that they had very much in common, especially the sections concerning human rights and their protection. Mintimer Shaymiyev believes that it is necessary to use all democratic principles and prepare such a draft constitution which could be accepted by the majority of the subjects of the federation and approved by all the peoples of Russia.

Yarov Visits Ufa To Discuss Constitution

LD1905193193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent Gafurov from Ufa; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Russian Deputy Prime Minister Yuriy Federovich Yarov has spent two days in Ufa. He took part in discussions held by the Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet Presidium on the draft constitution of the Russian Federation offered by President Boris Yeltsin. Participants in the meeting noted that the new constitution is being parepared in the new conditions of democracy in Russia. At the same time they made many critical comments and suggestions. In particular, they noted that the presidential draft does not take into account constitutional development of the republics within the Russian Federation. It ignores the right of nations to self- determination and the Federation Treaty since the first chapter of the draft practically overrules the second one. [video cuts to show M.G. Rakhimov, chairman of the Bashkortostan parliament, speaking]

[Rakhimov] I think that if all the subjects [of the Federation] work on the new draft constitution and if their supreme bodies [of power] adopt it, I am 100 percent convinced that the Congress of People's Deputies will adopt the new constitution of the Russian Federation.

Lobov Visits Cheboksary To Discuss Draft Constitution

LD1905131393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Oleg Lobov, first deputy chairman of the council of ministers and economics minister, has arrived in Cheboksary today. There he will attend a conference of the republic's leaders to discuss the presidential draft Russian Constitution, ITAR-TASS reports. This is a very important issue for Russia, the deputy prime minister told journalists. With the adoption of the constitution, all conditions will have been created for forward movement in the economy. Russia has a vast potential, and there is no question of departing from economic reforms, of some kind of curb on freedom of enterprise, or of renouncing market relations. On the contrary, the new constitution will fully open opportunities for all this, he stressed.

Shakhray Checks on Draft Constitution Work in Far East

OW1905125093 Khabarovsk Radio Khabarovsk Network in Russian 0845 GMT 19 May 93

[From the "Kray News" program]

[Text] Sergey Shakhray, vice premier of the Russian Federation, Sergey Stankevich, presidential adviser on political matters, and Aleksandr Kotenkov, Russian People's deputy, arrived in Khabarovsk today. They took part in the regional conference on the conceptual adoption of the constitution of the Russian Federation. Representatives of the Far East krays and oblasts spoke on the progress of work on the draft constitution, and put forward their criticism and proposals. The vice premier also met with leaders of the territorial executive and the legislative powers, and Sergey Stankevich, the presidential adviser answered questions from representatives of parties, movements, and other public organizations.

Sobchak Urges Constituent Assembly To Adopt Constitution

LD1905193793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent Vladimir Batalov from St. Petersburg; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The new Russian constitution should be adopted not by the Congress of People's Deputies but rather by a constituent assembly. This is the opinion of two-thirds of the inhabitants of St. Petersburg who took part in a local opinion poll. In the referendum on 25 April, about 50 million inhabitants of Russia called for the pre-term recall of the corps of deputies.

St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, who spoke at a discussion of the Basic Law in the Tauride Palace, considers therefore that the present composition of the congress does not have the exclusive right to adopt the new constitution. The last word should remain with a constituent assembly. It is not just representatives of subjects of the federation, the Supreme Soviet, and the congress who should take part in this assembly, but also political parties of various orientations, social movements, and the trade unions. For only a constituent meeting or assembly will be able to speak on behalf of the whole people.

Apart from the mechanism of adopting the Basic Law, the meeting in the Tauride Palace discussed whose draft was the better. The participants in the meeting did not agree on everything. Some think that Rumyantsev's view eulogizes the power of the soviets while the president's has a dictatorial or even a monarchist hue.

To a certain extent the meeting in the Tauride Palace reflected the spectrum of points of view and opinions which has arisen throughout Russia.

Comments on Russian Presidency

LD1905171593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1528 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Arkadiy Sosnov]

[Text] St. Petersburg May 19 TASS—Recent statements of some politicians on their intention to run for president are a false start, and not the beginning of a well-considered campaign, believes St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak.

He told the north-west regional newspaper "some politicians have never ceased the campaign - one of them is Zhirinovskiy (the leader of the Russian Liberal-Democratic Party - ITAR-TASS note). But it is senseless to speak of new elections before Russian constitutional basis is renovated.

"It is important what rules to play with; the rules will determine the president we will choose. If we replace some people, incapable of thinking and working, with other, we will just aggravate the problems. If we again elect a 1,000-strong Congress of Deputies, 400 members of the St. Petersburg City Council and 150-200 deputies to each district council, this will hardly help.

"Thus, the approach to the system of elections, the system of power and division of functions - what we call a constitution - should be essentially changed.

"We should aim at achievable goals, the immediate one is the constitution. After its adoption and the adoption of a new law on elections, we will be able to hold elections in fall; then the presidential campaign will begin," noted Sobchak.

Asked whether he will run for president, the mayor noted "in contrast to these politicians, I perfectly understand the responsibility the president will carry. It is irony to hear someone claiming his ability to become the president and not understanding a 100th part of president's burden. The struggle for new society and democracy in Russia is my goal, no matter what post I am on."

Sobchak did not comment in detail on his personal plans.

Regions View Moscow's Actions on Constitution

PM2005110393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Article by Pavel Yakovlev: "Harnessed to the Same Wagon..."]

[Text] The main sensation last week was the 14 May statement by the heads of the Russian Federation republics' Supreme Soviets on the new draft Russian Constitution and procedure for its adoption. The statement has been signed so far by the leaders of 11 of the 19 Russian republics. The signatures of the heads of Tatarstan, Kalmykia, and all the North Caucasus republics, except Adygea, are missing. Nonetheless, it can be confidently forecast that the Caucasians will subscribe to the statement and thus it will become practically a common document for all the Russian republics. And their position is of very great importance for the adoption of any version of a new Constitution.

With this in mind, the president's draft takes very great steps to meet the republics' needs. In particular, it preserves the principle, enshrined in the appendix to the Federal Treaty, of the formation of an upper chamber of parliament, whereby one-half of the seats in it will go to the republics (despite the fact that only 14 percent of the country's population lives in republics formed in accordance with the national-territorial principle). You might think the republics would have been satisfied... But... the 14 May statement by the republic heads uses an extremely strong tone in rejecting the president's draft on the grounds that it ignores the "historical and present-day realities of Russian statehood." The republics are unhappy with the fact that the first section of the Constitution does not include provisions on them as sovereign states and it lacks an article on the right of nations to self-determination.

The republics' demands, with the hot air removed, go far beyond a federal system, and, if implemented, would make our state into a confederation. But neither the president, nor parliament, in fact, no sensible central authority could go that "far." So it can be assumed that the republics that signed the statement did not expect their fantastic demands to be met, but were merely trying to test the strength of their influence on the course of the political struggle in Moscow.

Although the republics' antipresidential move is to parliament's advantage, it was hardly initiated by it. The statement stresses that "any unconstitutional way of adopting a new Constitution" is unacceptable to the republics, although this cannot be interpreted as the republics backing the Congress, indeed the republics only recently blocked the adoption of the "Rumyantsev" Constitution at the Sixth Congress. Therefore, it has to be admitted that a third force—national-territorial entities—has publicly entered the Russian political arena, and instead of a powerless "dyarchy," what we are seeing take shape here is an even more powerless "triarchy."

The republics have taken advantage of the Moscow infighting and are trying to get as many concessions as possible out of the center, by backing first one and then the other branch of authority. The Russian krays and oblasts are not being left out of it either and they are pushing for equal rights with the republics. The first alarm bell has already rung—Vologda Oblast has declared itself a state within Russia, thus placing its constitutional rights on a par with those of the republics.

One cannot help noticing a very probable connection between the statement's appearance and the dismissal of Security Council Secretary Yuriy Skokov, who was (or still is) secretary of the Council of Heads of Republics of the Russian Federation. Skokov, who wields considerable influence among the republic leaders, could well have initiated this statement, in order to demonstrate his power to Yeltsin and to his opponents in the president's circle.

But the president does not appear to be particularly alarmed by this development. At least, when he spoke at a meeting with democrats on 17 May, Yeltsin called the matters raised by the Federation members "not that insoluble."

A session of the Council of Heads of Republics, planned for 26 May, will focus on the solution of these problems. It is difficult to say at the moment what the outcome of the "haggling" will be, although in the event of a successful outcome, the way will be clear to the Constitutional Conference planned for 5 June. The idea is that all 89 members of the Federation will be equally represented at the Constitutional Conference. This just principle suits the Russian krays and oblasts, but could meet with objections on the part of the republics. But the likelihood is that the republics will make concessions in the end, recognizing that they will still have the last word: The president reckons that the Constitutional Conference will have completed its work when all the Federation members have initialed the draft Constitution. Probably no one knows at the moment how to bring this about. Making the draft Constitution acceptable both to the republics and to the krays and oblasts is the most difficult task today for all those who want to "give the country a Constitution."

PRAVDA Cites Regional Hostility to Yeltsin Draft

PM1905105793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 93 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Not Everyone Likes Kremlin Basket"]

[Text] How embarrassing! Television, radio, and the mighty orchestra of the democratic press were so assiduously creating a beautiful chorale of universal and mass support for the draft constitution Yeltsin-style—then suddenly such dissonance. Eleven Russian republics (out of 19!) have unequivocally declared that they reject this hastily cobbled document. The Supreme Soviet chairmen who signed the statement believe that the Fundamental Law can be adopted only constitutionally—by the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies.

We name these republics: Adygea, Altay, Bashkortostan, Komi, Karelia, Mariy El, Mordovia, the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), Tuva, Udmurtia, and Khakassia.

It is not possible to sweep all crumbs from the table with a sweep of the wing. Even if it is the wing of the president himself.

So, what are the republics upset about? Above all, the fact that the president's draft runs counter to the Federation Treaty, which in its time the republics secured literally through suffering. Here we go again, then? For the draft ignores the chief thing—recognition of the republics as sovereign states and their voluntary incorporation into Russia. Disregarding the principles of the Federation Treaty, the president's draft herds the republics into an authoritarian state. But they have eaten this gruel before....

In addition, the leaders of the republic parliaments believe that the draft speaks very vaguely of the peoples' rights in respect of self-determination in the national-state and national-cultural forms which they prefer.

Incidentally, fears were also expressed at a recent conference in Murmansk—albeit with a different thrust—when heads of administrations and leaders of local soviets of the republics and oblasts of northwest Russia met. Its participants believe that the powers of oblasts and krays in the sphere of socioeconomic rights must be made equal with the republics' powers. Pavel Balakshin, head of the Arkhangelsk Oblast Administration, saw in the president's draft a dangerous possibility for the growth of separatism.

In short, no way do the republics and oblasts of Russia want to end up wholesale in the president's basket....

Report Finds Tuva Leaning Toward Independence

MK1905095493 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 17, 18 May 93 (signed to press 17 May) p 3

[Zhanna Trofimova report: "Independence Is Recalled in Tuva More and More Often"]

[Text] The Republic of Tuva is a sovereign state of the whole people [obshchenarodnoye] which is part of the Russian Federation. It has the right to self-determination and to secession from the Russian Federation if this is decided by a national referendum—this phrasing of Article 64 of the republic's Constitution was adopted by the 19th extraordinary session of the Tuvan parliament. Article 65 stipulates "the territorial integrity of the republic," adding that the territory "is inviolable and may not be changed without the consent of the people." In effect, this amounts to legally establishing the possibility of recreating an independent state of Tuva, which was abolished in 1944 when Tuva joined the RSFSR as an autonomous republic.

Separatist sentiment has recently been gaining ground in Tuva, intensifying especially after the breakup of the USSR. Consequently, "big brother" is blamed for all Tuva's woes. Russia is more and more often blamed for "the exploitation of natural riches" and "the subjugation of the people." The thesis that the situation in the center is unstable and messy and, therefore, it is essential to carry out a more independent economic policy, is gaining popularity.

The People's Party of Sovereign Tuva and the People's Front "Free Tuva" are the most active proponents of independence. Tuva's top leaders appear to share this sentiment. They make a point of distancing themselves from the center, although it is officially declared that "independent and sovereign Tuva is an inalienable part of Russia." Mr. Bicheldey, chairman of the Tuvan parliament, openly argues in the press for quick secession.

So far, only one-third of the deputy corps supports the idea of holding a referendum on state independence. Nonetheless, political parties and deputies factions easily find common language on the subject. At the 19th Supreme Soviet session "decisions on self- determination" were supported by both the communists and members of the Democratic Russia faction.

According to local observers, "the opinion is expressed more and more distinctly in society that the development of events will proceed along the path of the attainment of independence." If existing trends continue, the cessation of payments to the federal budget, the conversion to a bilateral relationship with Russia, and, finally, Tuva's withdrawal from the Federation Treaty appear a fairly real possibility.

'Differences of Approach' Lead to Khabarovsk Resignations

PM1705143193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 14 May 93 p 7

[Valeriy Golovin report: "Mayor's Dismissal"]

[Text] Khabarovsk—By a directive of Khabarovsk Kray Administration head V. Ishayev, A. Dmitrichenko, mayor of the city of Amursk, who is "famous" for his machinations with cars and his love of foreign trips, has been dismissed.

It was also stated that V. Shemanov and A. Sukhanov, heads of administration of Bikinskiy and Solnechnyy Rayons, had failed to solve the territories' socioeconomic problems. All three were released at their own request.

But whereas the departure of the leaders of local organs of executive power can be attributed to their incompetence, many people are connecting the replacements in the kray administration itself with differences of approach to carrying out reforms, primarily in the economy. Doctor of Economic Sciences P. Minakir recently left the post of first deputy head. V. Tikhonov, chairman of the Kray Committee for the Economy, has followed in his footsteps and resigned.

Ingush Congress Adopts Declaration on State Sovereignty

LD1505174193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1700 GMT 15 May 93

[Text] An extraordinary Congress of the Peoples of Ingushetia held in Nazran today adopted a declaration on state sovereignty. It will serve as a basis for a constitution of the Ingush Republic, which was declared a democratic, law-based, and secular state within the Russian Federation on the basis of the Federation Treaty.

Congress Appeals to Chechens To Resolve Crisis Peacefully

LD1905165593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0834 GMT 19 May 93

[by ITAR-TASS correspondent Sharip Asuyev]

[Text] Groznyy, 19 May—The Political Council of the North Caucasian Democratic Congress has called on the president, parliament, and opposition of Chechnya to use only peaceful means in their attempts to get out of the critical situation in the republic. The statement issued and circulated today in Groznyy by this organization, which unites all democratic forces in the region, says that "the unmanageable events and the escalation of the political crisis may have tragic consequences for the peoples of the Chechen Republic as well as for the North Caucasian region as a whole."

The Political Council also stated that it deems it unacceptable for any third force to interfere in Chechnya's internal political conflict.

Similar statements and appeals come from the public and political movements and parties of many neighboring republics. Messages expressing serious concern have arrived from Near East countries and from representatives of the Caucasian diaspora.

Meanwhile, it appears that the power crisis in Chechnya is deepening. Neither side is prepared to retreat. Two weeks before the referendum on the form of government for the republic, scheduled for 5 June, the forces in opposition to president Dzhokhar Dudayev have shifted the focus of their activities from Groznyy to other towns and settlements of Chechnya. A wave of rallies, meetings, and gatherings of citizens is sweeping the republic. Practically all the working collectives, offices, and departments have been drawn into the political struggle. Petty confrontations and skirmishes flare up from time to time between the opposing sides. However, there is hope that a serious confrontation can still be avoided.

Ural Leaders Propose Return to 'Guberniyas'

MK1905112093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 19 May 93 p 11

[Valeriy Pogorelyy commentary published in the "Around the New Constitution" column: "Debates on Constitution Intensify Split Among Regions"]

[Text] It appears that the conflict between the authorities has, after all, brought about a situation that the White House and the Kremlin were warning each other about. The split has spilled over to the regions and is now occurring not only between the soviets and administrations but also along the borders of the republics, oblasts, and krays. The parliament leaders in 11 Russian republics have stayed loyal to the idea of soviet power and rejected the presidential draft constitution. On the other hand, yesterday's conference in Yekaterinburg of heads of administrations from five Ural oblasts rejected the republics themselves, proposing a return to the traditional division of Russia into multi-ethnic guberniyas.

The main claim being made by the heads of parliaments in the republics of Komi, Mariy El, Tuva, Khakasiya, Sakha (Yakutiya), and others, which recently came out with a statement, relates to the Federation Treaty which, incidentally, is a component part of both draft constitutions. Yet it is precisely Boris Yeltsin's draft that does not satisfy the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets, since it does not contain a major provision stating the republics are sovereign states and that their incorporation into Russia is voluntary. In addition, in the opinion of the heads of the Supreme Soviets, the presidential draft virtually ignores the rights of the peoples. Therefore, they warn, either the ideas and principles of the Federation Treaty will be consistently implemented or Russia will turn into an authoritarian state.

Vice Premier Oleg Labov, who made his first trip in his new capacity to Udmurtiya (which co-signed the joint statement) trying to agitate in favor of Yeltsin's draft, has failed dismally. In Izhevsk it was suggested to the president's envoy that there was undue haste over the discussion of such major state issues and they refused to sign any document in approval of the draft constitution. Vice Premier Yuriy Yarov arrived in Ufa yesterday to discuss the draft constitution. In all likelihood, however, he too will not succeed in enlisting the support of the local authorities. In Bashkortostan there is an equally negative attitude to both drafts although no statement has been made declaring that Bashkortostan refuses to discuss the Russian fundamental law, as the Supreme Soviet of Tatarstan has done.

Therefore the idea put forward by Ruslan Khasbulatov at a recent conference of heads of soviets in Moscow—that Yeltsin's draft contains a threat to the republics' independence—has fallen on fertile soil and produced sturdy sprouts.

The struggle around the constitution has given vent to the long-brewing dissatisfaction of the oblasts with their second-rate status compared with the republics. The participants in the Yekaterinburg conference described the current hierarchy of the Federation's components as a "time bomb for the next stage of Russia's disintegration." The heads of five Ural oblasts suggested that the constitution include a provision for a return to guberniyas, formed not on an ethnic but on a territorial principle, which would enjoy equal economic rights and independence. The governors should be appointed by the president. Boris Yeltsin must be deeply grateful to his fellow countrymen in the Urals for this proposal. Now he can always remind the heads of the republics in opposition about the Yekaterinburg idea. Meanwhile Vologda Oblast has already realized this proposal by declaring itself a "state-territorial subject" at an oblast council session, asking the Russian Supreme Soviet to accord it a status equal to that of the republics.

Soskovets To Talk With Urals Industry Chiefs

PM1905113193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 18 May 93 p 1

[Yuriy Yuryev report: "Managers Will Obviously Submit a Claim—First Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets' First Working Trip to Yekaterinburg in His New Capacity"]

[Text] Oleg Soskovets was in Yekaterinburg quite recently—in the fall of last year. At that time, in his days as chairman of the Russian Federation Committee for Metallurgy, he was accompanying Yegor Gaydar. Since then, the government's approaches to the economic situation in the country have changed drastically. Colleagues of Soskovets, who now hold key posts in the Cabinet, are resolutely declaring a change in the course of reforms, primarily implying state regulation of the economy.

In the light of this, talks between the first vice premier in charge of leading sectors of industry (metallurgy, machine building, transport, and so on) and the managers are of major significance.

Many severe problems, variously characteristic of the entire Russian production sector, have built up in the region now. The combined debt of enterprises here reached 180 billion rubles [R] by 1 April. Many military-industrial complex plants which managed to break into foreign markets with their products have been forced to wind down production owing to high customs duties. The slump in production in the oblast's leading sectors is continuing, and production volumes in the first quarter come to a little over 77 percent of the last year's indicators.

So it is that at a meeting between Oleg Soskovets and the oblast managers it is proposed to discuss such serious questions as the need for a new taxation system, a way of eradicating nonpayment, and the fine-tuning of finance and credit policy.

Indeed, there is nothing new in the formulation of these questions. For a long time already they have preyed on the minds of both the managers and the government. In fact, last week the government even tasked appropriate ministries and departments with preparing proposals on introducing amendments and additions to taxation legislation. A decree signed by Viktor Chernomyrdin pointed out the need to provide tax incentives for enterprises operating in priority sectors—industrial production, the processing of agricultural produce, and construction.

This measure will undoubtedly be met by the captains of industry with a cheer. However, one thing is sure to lead to another. It is not ruled out that the managers will demand equally resolute actions by the Cabinet to resolve all other production problems. In particular, the eradication of enterprise debts on a basis of mutual off-setting, as was done at the beginning of this year.

The overall political situation in the country will doubtless have a tremendous influence on the outcome of the dialogue. The fate of the new draft Constitution depends to a great extent on how it is perceived in the regions. And as we know, the corps of managers has not only major economic power but major political power too.

Resists Pleas for 'State Regulation'

PM2005083193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 May 93 p 1

[Unattributed report under "In the Government" rubric: "Oleg Soskovets Urged Economic Managers Not to Rely on Credits"]

[Text] The government will defend the interests of national commodity producers in market conditions, Russian First Vice Premier Oleg Soskovets declared in Yekaterinburg at a meeting with Sverdlovsk Oblast managers and local authorities. Considering protectionism a form of support and a regulator in itself, he stressed that "in everything else economic managers must exploit their own potential to revive production, shifting hopes of state credits into the background."

The vice premier listened calmly to proposals from Urals managers on the need to introduce elements of state regulation of price formation in the most important sectors for the period of transition to the market, as well as to arguments on the subject from staff of a number of ministries and the Central Bank who accompanied him. Despite significant differences in the sides' views, Oleg Soskovets declared that "it is impossible to get away from these problems, but we have to resolve them together, as a unified team." Ending the meeting, which he did not want to spoil with "political evaluations of the situation in the economy," Oleg Soskovets expressed a desire to meet with representatives of Yekaterinburg's commercial structures and banks.

Group Sells Su-27's To Buy Color TV Production Line

LD1805105693 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0900 GMT 18 May 93

[Text] The Komsomolsk-na-Amure aviation production association intends to meet the demand for hi-fi TV equipment in the Far East. ITAR-TASS reports that the association signed a contract with a South Korean company, Lucky Gold Star, to purchase a production line to manufacture 50,000 color TV's a year. The enterprise got the $3 million needed to buy the equipment from selling Su-27 supersonic fighter planes. The association plans to produce the first batch of TV sets as early as the second half of this year.

Arkhangelsk To Close Nuclear Submarine Town of Severodvinsk

LD1905155693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 19 May 93

[By Paphushina; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The Arkhangelsk Oblast inner soviet, headed by Yuriy Aleksandrovich Guskov, a people's deputy of the Russian Federation, has adopted a decision to include Severodvinsk on the list of towns and areas with the status of closed administrative-territorial entity. But why? With the scrapping of nuclear submarines—and there are nine of them in the water at Severodvinsk at present—there is a possibility of technological breaches at machine-building enterprises during the unloading of nuclear reactors, storing them off the town's shore, and scrapping and transporting them. This was the only way the military-industrial complex and the Navy could reliably conceal all this information. So the Arkhangelsk inner soviet backed them and decided to close the town.

International Affairs

Kravchuk, Yeltsin To Discuss Black Sea Fleet in Jun

WS1805150193 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1320 GMT 18 May 93

[Text] Sevastopol, 18 May—"SLAVA SEVASTOPOLA" ["Glory of Sevastopol"], the city's newspaper, has reported that President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine have agreed to meet in Sevastopol in mid-June. The meeting is expected to take place on 15 June and will address the Black Sea fleet problem.

Morozov Confirms 'Immutability' of Stance on Black Sea Fleet

PM1905134793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 93 p 2

[Aleksandr Golub report: "Dividing Up and Clearing Off"]

[Text] Lvov—The immutability of Ukraine's stance on the Black Sea Fleet has been confirmed yet again by General K. Morozov, the republic's defense minister, speaking at a public meeting in Lvov.

We should make use of the transitional period imposed on us by the Yalta agreement to divide up the fleet. Ukraine is taking goodwill steps in this area too. By dividing up the fleet we are helping Russia to create a Russian grouping of warships in the Black Sea, but it is a question solely of dividing up warships. No treaty can make us share Ukrainian land with another state, he said. The minister also believes that, in dividing up the ships, the sides should adopt as a package an agreement which would lead at the end of the transitional period to the non-Ukrainian part of the Black Sea Fleet's being withdrawn beyond Ukrainian borders, so as to ensure that there is not a single foreign vessel or foreign sailor on its territory.

Russian Commander on Black Sea Fleet's 'Dominant Position'

LD1805164193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0935 GMT 18 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunayskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 18 May—"Despite the fact that juridically relations between the Black Sea Fleet and the Ukrainian Navy have not been defined in legal documents, businesslike relations exist between us," Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin, commander of the Black Sea Fleet stated at a meeting with journalists in Sevastopol. An ITAR- TASS correspondent learned this at the Black Sea Fleet press center.

Commenting on the Black Sea Fleet's politico-strategic significance for the interests of Russia and Ukraine, the vice admiral noted that the Black Sea Fleet is at present an element in the balance of forces in this region, and a part of the military system of deterrence. Should the Black Sea Fleet withdraw from this it could lead to a change in the balance of forces, the commander of the fleet said.

In Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin's opinion, the Black Sea Fleet currently maintains fairly solid positions. If one takes the naval forces of the states within the Black Sea region, he said, then in terms of its present state and level of combat training and battle readiness, the Black Sea Fleet occupies a dominant position in the Black Sea.

As far as the Turkish Navy is concerned, I believe that many experts have been in too much of a hurry in talking about its superiority over ours. In my estimation, to achieve this it will need 5-10 years, assuming the Black Sea Fleet is maintained in the same form as it is today, bearing in mind quantitative and qualitative characteristics. Of course, if the fleet is to be fragmented, this timeframe for the Turkish Navy will be shortened, Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin stressed.

In the past we had the Joint Black Sea Fleet, which included, apart from the Black Sea Fleet, the navies of Bulgaria and Romania, Vice Admiral Baltin reminded journalists. "This no longer exists, but we have something else," he noted. "For example, in order to monitor shipping on the Danube, the Americans allocated ocean-going reconnaisance aircraft of the Orion type. For these same purposes the NATO countries are allocating patrol craft based in Burgas and Constanza. Add to this a record number of vessels of the North Atlantic bloc (eight), which entered the Black Sea at the end of last year, and also a record period for the stay here of the American warship Kauffman in April 1993."

Any strategist, the Black Sea Fleet commander noted, possessing such information, could conclude that the NATO countries are testing out their naval presence in our region on a permanent basis, the first stage of which is being conducted under the guise of peace-keeping activities and on the basis of a mandate of international organizations.

Officials Refute OBSERVER Information on Arms Sales to Iran

AU1905115093 Kiev DEMOKRATYCHNA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 18 May 93 p 2

[Commentary by Ihor Lyashenko: "Anti-Ukrainian Sentiments Are Already Flying in Cruise Missiles"]

[Text] Moscow newspapers picked up the information carried by the London OBSERVER of 9 May to the effect that Ukraine had allegedly sold eight cruise missiles to Iran. This is a sensational report, particularly in the context in which it is presented—the vigorous activity of Ukrainian diplomacy in Iran (recent visits by Vice Prime Minister Yu. Ioffe and Supreme Council chairman I. Plyushch plus Ukraine's well-known interest in the deliveries of Iranian oil and gas). The OBSERVER information also mentioned a "Ukrainian-Iranian Agreement on Modernizing the Army of the Islamic Republic of Iran" within the framework of which Ukraine is allegedly expected to sell to Iran a batch of fighter aircraft (including 50 MiG-29's), more than 200 T-72 tanks, and means for air defense.

Who did sell these missiles and is going to sell aircraft and tanks? Especially considering that Iran, Iraq, Cuba, Libya, and some other countries are on the UN banning weapons deliveries?

"Not us," categorically declared Vasyl Nipak, head of the Press Service at the Ministry of External Economic Relations. "The Ministry of External Economic Relations does not trade in weapons."

The Ministry of Defense also denied any such involvement.

The minister of machine building, military-industrial complex, and conversion also spoke categorically: "These are not simply fabrications, but rather a political provocation. We do not have such an agreement with Iraq [country as published]. I will say openly that questions of supplying weapons to Iran were raised more than once during the negotiations. It cannot be ruled out that after the visits by our governmental and parliamentary delegations to Iran, these questions will be raised again. However, no signed documents exist, and no cruise missiles could be supplied through our ministry, at least because Ukraine does not have cruise missiles at its disposal. Ukraine does not even have any complete-cycle weapons industry on its territory, none whatsoever, including cruise missiles."

Yuriy Sergyeyev, head of the Press Service at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, made this comment on the OBSERVER information: "This does not correspond to reality for many reasons. First, supersonic cruise missiles, such as those mentioned in the article, are nonexistent anywhere in the world. Second, Ukraine does not have sea-launched cruise missile at its disposal. The Black Sea Fleet has them, but it is not under Ukrainian jurisdiction. Regarding weapons sales in general, it certainly has the right to do this, with the exception, of course, of the restrictions imposed by interstate agreements and by the United Nations. However, today, there is no program for Ukraine's participation in the world weapons market. I also want to add that this is not the first time that Ukraine has been blamed erroneously for something that does not exist. We were already "trading" in weapons with the Republic of South Africa, with Sierra Leone, and with nonexistent Palestine (something that is totally unthinkable). In other words, this is yet another case of disinformation."

Yugoslav Mediators Owen, Stoltenberg To Arrive in Kiev

AU1905123993 Paris AFP in English 1229 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Kiev, May 19 (AFP)—Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, the international mediators on the Yugoslav conflict, were due here in the coming day for talks on the crisis, Ukrainian Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Tarasyuk said.

Tarasyuk told AFP the two negotiators were likely to ask Ukraine to increase the numbers of peacekeeping troops it has already deployed in Bosnia-Hercegovina as well as increased Ukrainian political influence to help resolve the conflict.

Tarasyuk said Owen and Stoltenberg would be meeting with Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoly Zlenko but were not scheduled to hold talks with President Leonid Kravchuk.

British officials involved in preparing the contacts between the two international mediators and Ukrainian officials said they could not confirm whether Owen and Stoltenberg would arrive later Wednesday or Thursday.

The two negotiators were in Bosnia Tuesday for talks with local leaders.

Government Denounces Bosnian Serb Referendum

LD1905201293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] In connection with the referendum on the Vance-Owen plan held among the Serb population of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine has issued a statement.

In it, it is noted, in particular, that this measure cannot but give rise to doubts as to the sincerity of intentions of those who thus hope to achieve a settlement to the conflicts and differences between this republic's citizens to their own advantage.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs expresses concern about violations of human rights and the position of ethnic minorities, in particular Ukrainians.

Seeking to contribute in practice to the establishment of peace here, Ukraine participates in the UN peacekeeping forces and has sent its military contingent there. The statement stresses that our state stands for finding a political settlement to the issue and putting an end to bloodshed in this region.

Foreign Ministry Protests Delays to Danube Shipping by Romania

LD1905213193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1324 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov]

[Summary] Bucharest, 19 May (ITAR-TASS)—The crews of ten Ukrainian tugs with 60 barges which have been detained for a month in the Romanian port of Galati in connection with UN sanctions against Serbia intend to block shipping on the Danube as a protest. A Ukrainian shipping spokesman says that some vessels have been detained since 3-4 April, before UN Security Council resolution 820 was adopted. There are about 300 crew members in the port region and many have not been ashore for three or four weeks. About 20 Ukrainian convoys en route for Hungary and Austria have been detained in various Romanian ports.

The spokesman said: "On Tuesday the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry handed the Romanian ambassador in Kiev a note saying that the Romanian authorities 'are detaining Ukrainian convoys on the Danube groundlessly' while many of them have already been checked by UN observers in the port of Reni."

The document notes that if Romania does not review its attitude toward Ukrainian vessels Kiev "will be obliged to take measures in response."

Officials at the Ukrainian diplomatic representation in Bucharest consider that these measures could include blocking the passage through Ukrainian territory of goods imported by Romania from CIS countries.

Commenting today at the request of the ITAR-TASS correspondent on the situation in the port of Galati, Mircea Gionna, an official spokesman of the Romanian Foreign Ministry, stressed that "there can be no question of deliberate detention of Ukrainian tugs" and that his country is only "trying to strictly observe the UN Security Council resolutions." At the same time he admitted that Romania, on its own initiative, has detained convoys which arrived in the port of Galati before 26 April, that is, before UN resolution 820 came into force, since this document "does not clearly set out instructions about convoys already en route." At the same time the Foreign Ministry representative expressed hope that "Ukraine will not draw hasty conclusions" from this difficult situation and that the disagreements which have arisen "will not affect relations between the two countries."

However, further delays to the vessels are expected.

Greek-U.S. Inspectors To Monitor Compliance With Treaty

LD1905154993 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 18 May 93

[Text] This 18-21 May, a Greek-U.S. group of inspectors is working in Ukraine to observe the fulfillment of the conventional arms reduction treaty by the Ukrainian side. This is not the first inspection of such a nature carried out within the Armed Forces of our state. All previous inspections confirmed that Ukraine has a responsible attitude toward the fulfillment of all the articles of the treaty.

National Affairs

Kuchma Asks To Resign at 20 May Parliament Session

LD2005131093 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1047 GMT 20 May 93

[Speech by Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma at parliament session in Kiev; first sentence spoken in Ukrainian, remainder in Russian —live]

[Text] Esteemed Chairman, esteemed president, esteemed colleagues. You know, I should say that in all honesty I bear absolutely no grudge for these two days of discussion, although I have not heard practically a single kind word in relation to me or the government, practically I beg your pardon.

However, probably the location of the seat determines the point of view: if I change my seat to one opposite Fokin, I too would probably, after a while, ask questions of Leonid Makarovych [Kravchuk] and propose not to raise prices, not to give subsidies, and to work out several social programs. And he is probably right in having decided to engage in political activity, because my conscience will not allow me to ask such questions when the president becomes head of government. That is, I would like to appeal to you, that one should be responsible for one's words, always, for what one says.

True, it is clear from the results of the debate that the government will not be given the powers and we—I confirm that—we got together with Leonid Makarovych yesterday and straightforwardly—I beg your pardon, I would ask you to hear me out. Everywhere, from the first day to the last, I said, and I repeat today, that in order to overcome the economic crisis—and I said that it was not only an economic one—executive power must be concentrated in a single pair of hands. Tell me please, you are reproaching me all the time for creating too many decrees and so on. Did we approve the status of the deputy? Did we? Did we pass the law on the Cabinet of Ministers?

In order to govern to a certain extent, and I will not elaborate on what I mean, this person must have in his hands, first personnel, second finance, and third accord, here among us. The government today has neither the first, nor the second, nor the third.

That is why, it is my opinion, and I asked Leonid Makarovych—I am speaking in all honesty, and I was most afraid he would suddenly change his mind overnight—to assume full responsibility as a president elected by the entire nation. In order for you to be sure that I am absolutely honest to you and to the president, I request that my resignation be accepted. Thank you.

18 May Address on Economy

LD1805211293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0700 GMT 18 May 93

[Address by Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma at parliament session in Kiev—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Chairman, esteemed President, esteemed deputies and representatives of the executive and local powers from throughout Ukraine.

I can honestly say that our government, which did not have within its composition prepared premiers, nor prepared ministers, and who had to face the acute shortage of experienced economists in Ukraine, is today just beginning to stand on its feet. In the beginning of my report I would like to stress in advance, so to say, two things: First, our economy is not doomed to failure. In the first quarter of 1993 the decline in production decreased three-fold and the gross national product two-fold. [sentence as heard] In the four months between November and February the following important indicators rose—5.6 percent more energy was produced than last year; coal by 11 percent; metal-working lathes by 9 percent; forging machines by 30 percent; tractors by 7.5 percent; cars by 7.8 percent; haulage trailer by 29 percent; car tires by 9 percent—one can go on listing them much further. Beginning from January the average daily production in the metallurgy industry is consistently increasing. I will not explain again in what conditions of energy supplies and management this took place. The government is grateful for the understanding on the part of labor collectives and directors.

Second, Ukraine has entered an energy crisis. At first, we expected an improvement in relations with Russia, then to jointly increase the extraction of oil in Tyumen and so on. Now I am forced to state that today the energy crisis in Ukraine is determined not only by Russia's political direction or by the output of oil wells, but above all by the price of energy carriers. In the last four months the price of gas has increased by 40 times, and in the last two years the price of gasoline has increased by 1,700 times. I want to remind you that when in 1973 the OPEC countries raised the overall price of oil by four times, then all the developed countries of the West were forced to freeze wages for almost 10 years. In this period, two percent—I stress two percent—of the entire world's gross national product flowed to the Persian Gulf countries. Today, the real price for Ukraine's energy carriers is such that from 1 May we would be forced to grant subsidies to energy producers amounting to 43 billion karbovantsi every day, i.e., if one is to obediently fulfil parliament's moratorium on raising, among others, the wholesale prices on energy carriers, then this would cost our ragged budget half a trillion karbovantsi only in the period from 6-18 May. The Ukrainian Gas Company would spend more than 12 billion karbovantsi every day; the Ministry of Energy, 14.5 billion. [passage omitted]

Now allow me to go over to a detailed account of some issues. First, what has happened to our economy in the last six months? Second, what will the government do further? We will, therefore, return to the autumn of 1992, when the government was granted emergency powers. Today, I am convinced that it was a timely and wise decision by the parliament. This precedent again proves that the constitutional right of control over the government in the Supreme Council is not only the right to punish but also the right to help the government. The prime minister, having to deal with the severe crisis in the economy, cannot be a parrot that repeats slogans and watchwords of politicians. The masses are cool toward slogans when they are hungry.

What did we begin to do back in the autumn? We begin with the fact that with the help of a number of decrees we mastered or, it is better to say, in some measure we restored the management of state enterprises to ourselves. I cannot say that my old colleagues and directors liked this simple thought that was contained in our decrees. A director is a manager who is employed by the state in order to effectively manage its assets. But there was no other way to stabilize the economy where 90 percent belongs to the state sector.

What have we succeeded in doing here? First, we have stopped the increase in wages against the background of a decline in production. We have made directors aware that the state is again appearing in his rules of play as the owner, or if you wish, as the controller. If you want to receive more, then produce more. Everyone understand this, but unfortunately not always when it concerns the individual. As Sharipov, deputy head of Uzbekistan's Cabinet of Ministers told me yesterday, some Ukrainian metallurgical plants, while infringing the interbank agreement, are still demanding the transfer of money for their products in rubles to their account at the commercial Impex Bank in Moscow, to various joint stock companies in Rostov-on- Don, the Avtogaz Bank in Nizhniy Novgorod, and so on. Therefore, the practice is as follows—first hide the money while investing it in a foreign economy and strengthening a foreign currency, then demand, through parliament, repayment of the debt from the government and the National Bank, and at the same time strengthening inflation in the native economy and provoking people to ask for an increase in wages. Workers of the sector do not know that money for their products remains beyond Ukraine's borders or stays in ports or on the railroads, and rightly demand a salary increase. [passage omitted]

In conducting a policy of stabilizing Ukraine's production the government had the intention of first saving the industrial potential and the consumer market. Stabilization was being conducted primarily through macroeconomic and administrative methods and was directed above all at creating more severe financial conditions for the existence of enterprises, and the rationalization of productive links, both within Ukraine and in the CIS. The obligatory prepayment, realistically introduced, permitted the financial state of our enterprises to be somewhat improved, but mainly stopped the crediting of

Russia's industry at Ukraine's expense, and became an impulse for raising the effectiveness of production.

A sufficiently tough limitation on wage increases without the ability to buy goods allowed prices on the consumer market to stabilize from the second half of January to the second half of March. The karbovanets-dollar rate stayed the same all the time, but in relation to the ruble the karbovanets even became stronger. A further analysis of the work of the government from the time of it being granted extraordinary powers leads us to the conclusion that these powers were insufficient. This is my point of view, because the most important sphere of regulating the economy, monetary-credit relations, remained outside the powers.

I do not want to be understood in this way, as if one has not managed to overcome the crisis, that the government has come straight to the Supreme Council to complain about insufficient powers. I do not believe that there are naive people here who believe that a crisis can be overcome in five months. But can the economy really be stabilized without the sphere of monetary-credit and currency relations being fully controlled? I think that whoever is making some noise will laugh differently a bit later on.

To truly stabilize the government program...[changes thought] The realistic stabilization program of the government was on the whole based on antiinflationary measures. We went into inflationary development, because this was inevitable for our society. Our inflation is not only an economic phenomenon, but a social one, too. Our parliament's deputies, those working in our Cabinet of Ministers, our trade unions, and wide strata of society, are only just beginning to understand realistically the connection between prices and wages, between taxes and investments, between the structural reconstruction of our economy and the shelves in the shops. This is both important and good. Constant demands for carrying out mutual reckoning and credits on favorable terms, and requests that the government allocates funds—which simply do not exist in the budget—are characteristic in this sense. Inflation is politically revived each time we begin to pander to such demands and requests. Inflation is not only evidence of the economy's weakness, but also evidence of the weakness of state power or political wisdom. In order for the whole state to learn how to live, one might say, on one's wages, and not in debt; in order to feel all the advantages of a stable monetary unit, we need to go through and overcome inflation.

The government has on the whole employed two antiinflationary measures. The first is to limit enterprises' consumption funds. The second is to regulate prices. Limitation of consumption funds can be efficient only if tough monetary policy is implemented. The cheap credits of the National Bank in February and March at the level of 30-40 percent per annum were not controlled by anyone, and were issued by bankrupt enterprises for wages. I have no doubts today that only a government can fully implement a realistic stabilization program, one which receives the levers of regulation and control in the sphere of monetary-credit and currency relations, and also puts a fully fledged national monetary unit, the hryvna, into circulation. A government of salvation is not the government of Kuchma or some other person. It is a government of a firm hryvna as the basis of the economy.

To show that one can entrust the work with money to the government in question, with all of its problems and ills, I want to point out the situation that arose before and during our time with the taxation system. From my point of view the theoretical debate surrounding the taxation system did great harm to Ukraine's economy. I am above all appealing to practical people, of whom there is a prevailing majority in this hall today. Together with you, esteemed deputies, we have been continuously changing the principles of taxation in recent years. We somehow cannot master the simple axiom that capital and ideas only work in a state where stable and liberal taxation exists. I give my word that the government will advance in this direction step by step. In our decrees we have refused to levy income tax from enterprises, and switched to levying profit tax, and this at a normal rate. We have considerably reduced value added tax, from 28 to 20 percent. Incidentally, our example has been followed in Russia and Belarus. I believe that this approach justified itself.

Thus the budget received 19.6 billion karbovantsi from income tax on enterprises in the first quarter of last year. This comprised 7.4 percent of the annual revenue, and 425.7 billion karbovantsi of enterprises' profit tax were received in the first quarter of 1993. This comprises 31.5 percent of the yearly sum. This is the picture regarding value added tax.

In this way, in conditions of inflation, one needs to resolutely go over to liberalizing the taxation system. We will form the income of the budget with the assistance of (?the scope of) taxation, that is, stimulation, increasing production volumes, and not at the expense of essentially fiscal policy. However, I would like to emphasize that alongside liberalization of the taxation system we will pursue a policy of steadfast adherence to taxation laws. The checks that our tax service has carried out bear witness to gross violations of taxation discipline. Thus, at the beginning of the year the documents of more than 36,000 enterprises and organizations were inspected. Various violations by 26,700 tax payers were discovered. This is a check of 73 percent of tax payers. The budget, in addition, has received income for January- April of this year of more than 73 billion karbovantsi. Nonpayment of $73.5 million worth of deductions to the state currency fund was revealed. It has become customary in our economy to deceive the state.

The next direction of the government's actions about which I would like to speak is foreign economic activity. I will say straight away that we have been very late issuing quotas and licenses in the first quarter of (?1993).

In spite of this, just from the sale of products for export by enterprises of the Ministry of Industry in the first quarter, the state has already received more than $100 million. For the purpose of comparison, the exchequer received $167 million for the whole of 1992. As they say, we have a headache, too. We managed to plan $4.6 billion of exports, and at the same time $5.6 billion dollars of imports.

I could not understand this disproportion until my recent visit to Germany. In the last year we bought more from Germany than we sold by 1 billion German marks. As I saw with my own eyes, there is no real progress toward the German market, which is a priority one for us. To open marketing missions and missions of other intermediary firms, and missions of large Ukrainian enterprises—this is the task of our government. At the moment there is not even elementary information about Ukrainian producers. I understand that the 1,000 Ukrainian exporter enterprises, who in the former Union traded with the West via powerful all-Union foreign economic associations, today do not have either experience or specialists in this matter. But how can our ministry help them to get on to the foreign market while it is concentrating solely on issuing licenses. Incidentally, this shows yet again that a flag, a hymn and an emblem are not yet statehood. Long years of hard experience and work are needed, and in international trade, too.

(?Now I) should explain our foreign economic position. First, if we purchase more from abroad than we sell, we should encourage exports and strictly control state imports via the ministries and branches of industry. Our ministers have already learned how to spend hard currency easily. But a benefactor (?for) the State Currency Fund, apart from the Ministry of Industry, in practice, does not seem to be in evidence.

Second, while our domestic market is empty, we should encourage the import of scarce goods via commercial structures. Entry tariffs should be flexible, sensible, and tied to the domestic consumer market. I believe that only crucial imports and imports of high technology are permissible for the state sector. If you have bought chewing gum instead of equipment, then write a statement. If ministers do not bring in such a simple rule for their colleagues in ministries regarding directors-violators, then I will employ this principle for the ministers themselves.

The decree on liberalization of foreign economic activity, which we adopted yesterday, can only help to open a door onto world markets. I think that all of you already know that no one is waiting for us on those markets. But our raw materials, metals, chemicals, in conditions of an energy crisis, will become so much more expensive in forthcoming months and years that they will automatically lose the advantage they have today—their low cost. Previously we thought that dumplings in cream would be all right everywhere. Our export potential is continually falling. So the government's actions in foreign trade will be seriously reformed and strengthened in the near future.

To continue. I have often stated to parliament the government's firm intention to seriously support the nonstate sector of the economy and new forms of management. The processes in this sphere, especially regarding privatization, are proceeding much more slowly than we would like. I will name some well-known facts. Sixty-eight state enterprises were privatized in 1992, on the whole by labor collectives purchasing them. But products of small privatization, with the exception of Lvov, Khmelnitskiy, Rovno, and Kharkov, were not being sold by local authorities anywhere. One percent of state apartments have been privatized in the republic. One has to state that the privatization program for 1992 has generally not been implemented.

The government favors immediately beginning to auction products of small privatization in all towns and to direct the funds made to the budget. We should switch over to regular weekly auctions of property in all the large towns of our state. As far as large industrial enterprises are concerned, here, on the basis of the experience of our eastern European neighbors, we will not force events. The best in this sphere are selective pilot privatization schemes with the participation of foreign investors. In this matter we want to count on the auctioning process in the course of turning enterprises into corporations.

In summing up the experience of selective privatization at these enterprises, we can eventually, with fewer mistakes, carry out well-organized mass work at the stage of considerable destatization of industry. If one is to take data from the Ministry of Statistics as a basis, at the end of the first quarter of 1993, labor collectives property was 0.8 percent, the property of (?cooperatives) was 0.7 percent, and the property of economic societies was 0.5 percent. These indicators describe better than any words our absolutely state-bound economy.

One of the most acute problems of efficient procedure, which we had to work on, turned out to be the problems of fuel and power provision. I will say straight away that we were late in realistically preparing to resolve this. Therefore the government has been working vigorously in two directions—the efficient provision of energy -carriers for the current needs of the national economy and work for the future; the search for alternative sources of fuel and power provision and setting up an infrastructure for its utilization—so that overall a medium-term state program for three to five years is already being shaped.

The switchover to multiple provision for Ukraine with oil and oil products is becoming a reality, in particular, Ukraine's participation in extracting oil in Russia and other CIS countries, and purchasing oil from other countries. A national program for developing Ukraine's oil and gas industry has been elaborated and adopted by the government—a program for increasing oil and gas extraction, a program for refining oil. [passage omitted] Naturally, we can report to parliament today only that we are choosing all possible, and impossible, quotas for oil and gas. We have accumulated a little bit more in the first quarter of this year—there is heaps of work still to be done in this direction.

Now a few words about the agro-industrial complex. I think that agrarians will confirm the government's good intentions over six months to help rural areas in any way possible. During the first quarter in particular, in compliance with the decision of the Supreme Council on extra payments for meat and milk, for the purchase of bread grain and for settling accounts with the processing industry, the government granted credit to the sum of 803 billion karbovantsi, at the average annual interest rate of 30 percent. At the same time, last year's credits to the sum of over 180 billion karbovantsi were prolonged and [word indistinct] products to repay the debts to the sum of approximately $100 million were allocated. By a special decree the government provided an opportunity for agriculture to purchase oil products and other industrial goods at world prices to the value of $850 million, a quota of up to two percent [as heard], and allocated additional currency resources for the purchase of herbicides and pesticides. in terms of the present day official rate, during the first quarter of this year overall financial aid worth trillions of karbovantsi were rendered to the agro-industrial complex. Therefore, the government aided the enterprises of the agro- industrial clmplex with fuel, oils and lubricants. During this period from 75-80 percent of all the gasoline and diesel fuel produced in Ukraine were directed to the countryside. A state reserve of 200 tonnes [as heard] of gasoline and 400,000 tonnes of diesel fuel was set up. Therefore, the state gave the countryside everything it could.

I wish to thank the farmers for the fact that virtually everything that was planned for sowing, was sown. The leadership of the agro-industrial complex assurlocated thus from the rostrum of the Supreme Council that this year the countryside will produce goods to the sum of $30 billion. For this, it is necessary not only to sow and grow, but also to harvest and process them. So, our meetings with peasants has only just begun.

Yet another problem is the ever-growing crime rate. The main factors that lead to the worsening of the criminogenic situation are the negative after-effects of the economic depression, the unbalanced consumer market, te liegal deregulation of the functioning of new economic structures, the mass phenomena of mismanagement, and the irresponsibility of managers. As a result, there has been a growth in detected crimes of 14.4 percent over the past four months as compared with last year. The current criminogenic situation in Ukraine is to a great extent determined by crimes in the sphere of entrepreneurial and commercial activities. Dangerous tendencies are taking ever deeper root in the spheres of privatizaon's share of all avaing systems. This year, 815 violations of the law were exposed in these spheres against 549 last year. [passage omitted]

As a result of unskilful actions by the National Bank, virtually all the volume of currency transactions, required by the population, is today involved in the shadow economy. As a result, there has been a growth in illegal currency transactions by 118 percent. There is somilable credit anrs and those who formulated the decree on currency regulation, who gave all legal powers to the National Bank and so-called market mechanisms, should reflect upon. In practice, market mechanisms are not functioning here. Administrative control has been broken and it demonstrates its powerlessness daily in the center of the capital, in Khreshchatyk Street. [passage omitted]

Nothing is left for the government but to ask the Supreme Council for the right to set up a special federal structure under the government to combat organized crime, which would unite in practice the potential of special subdivisions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the security service of Ukraine. In my opinion, a special prosecutor's group could enter the composition of such a federal governmental structure. Besides, I consider it necessary to draw the attention of judges to the need to speed up the consideration of cases connected with organized crime and corruption. I will provide only one typical figure: In 1991 courts sentenced 91 percent of persons accused of theft of especially large sums; in 1992 the figure was only 58 percent. This year the figure became even lower. [passage omitted]

Another direction of the government's work over the half year, about which I would like to say something particular, is the so- called creation of decrees. In three years of activity the Supreme Council has created literally from nothing a legislative base for the young Ukrainian state. This is almost 200 laws. For the purpose of comparison, basic legislation in developed countries consists of several thousand laws. Right at the beginning the government came up against this legal vacuum. We were simply forced to regulate relations in haste, which, because of objective reasons, the Supreme Council did not manage to regulate—decrees on insurance activity, trust societies, on currency regulation, on everything under the sun, which cannot wait and brings losses. In spite of the thoroughness of our creation of decrees, one should recognize that prior to this, in many spheres there were no normative acts whatsoever, and chaos reigned. (?For example), customs tariffs did not exist in Ukraine from the moment the state arose, and the budget lost considerable funds.

As prime minister I am firmly in favor of standing commissions and people's deputies actively taking part both in preparing decrees and in controlling their quality. We have proposals regarding a mechanism for such cooperation. There is enough work and authority in the young state for all, provided there is the desire to roll up one's sleeves.

Let us understand that we do not personify the economy of the country in this hall. What does this economy produce? How does it produce it? For whom? The answers to these questions are determined by economic laws, and not by political power. It surprises me when some Ukrainian academicians try to rediscover socialism, or on the contrary, propagate only the American way of life. There are many developed European countries, where those same acquisitions of socialist theory have been employed much more successfully than in Ukraine, namely economic freedoms and private initiative are not stifled. All of the world's efficient economies have borrowed such things as all-embracing planning and a fair system of social security, and have conducted a tough system of sharing out income. [passage omitted]

What do I think Ukraine should do? It should open ways into the economy for the private sector in a planned way, calmly, and without anarchy. A national program of destatization needs to be elaborated for this, and agrarian reform should be prepared. Then, on the basis of, for example, a two-year or a five-year plan, not on some indicative plan, but a plan like a law. One needs to begin to implement all of this sensibly, and to ask officials about its implementation.

We voted for an independent Ukraine in the referendum in order to have a just society. But too many politicians appeared then who were similar to the lion which shared out the prey after the hunt. The lion took one share for himself as the king of the beasts, the second as a participant in the hunt, and the third because he is a lion. An efficient economy is capable of providing a worthy life for all Ukraine's citizens, and not just for lions.

I think that we, together with you, should undertake the reform of the economy, casting aside all political quarrels, ideological conflict, and loss-making strikes. It has happened more than once in history that accord has let weak and poor countries flourish, while enmity and quarrels have killed even great states.

Having set forth my general approach to the problems of our economy, I would like to make specific some urgent proposals. Yesterday our economy was producing everything which was needed for defense and for the reproduction of the means of production, actually without orientation to consumer goods, as strategically important. As a matter of fact, this very structure of production is a noticeable negative factor in our society. [passage omitted] It is evident to the government that this structural crisis, like the energy crisis, will long determine the everyday pace of our economy. [passage omitted]

Over the past two weeks the exchange rate of the cash ruble in relation to karbovanits at the exchange in Moscow and on the black market in Ukraine has been by 25 percent lower than the exchange rate of the ruble at the National Bank of Ukraine. And what's more, the Ukrainian commercial banks stopped transactions with rubles altogether because the exchange rate of the National Bank is unprofitable for them. I would like the deputies to understand me correctly: It goes now not for departmental interests. The national income produced in the first quarter of this year decreased against the corresponding period of 1992 by 11 percent. Although we managed to reduce almost by half the last year's rate of decline in the gross national product, I cannot but say today that in such a situation the National Bank must be subordinated without fail to the government.

Already today I have normal business-like contacts with the leadership of the bank, but at the sessions of the Cabinet of Ministers our bankers are sometimes like guests at a wedding party. [passage omitted] In my opinion this means first and foremost the need for a strict administrative control over the activities of all banks, which this way or another manipulate our state money. In practice it turns out that the great many so-called commercial banks with ridiculous authorized funds help state-owned enterprises hide their money to avoid taxation, remit currency abroad and from abroad, spend investment credits for paying wages. [passage omitted]

Over the four months of this year we have already got into debt of $188 million of the mass of commodities to Russia according to intergovernmental agreements. But isn't it clear that barter operations between our countries are not limited by intergovernmental agreements. The speculative exchange rate of the ruble will make our commodity producers give ever more Ukrainian- made products for the same amount of Russian-made products, to say nothing of the fact that our gross national product is flowing to Russia due to the energy crisis. Are we really destined to exchange our products for the Russian inflation? I am not going to blame Russia. Moreover, of late we concluded with Russia and other CIS countries a number of agreements on various issues of economic activity, and have good personal relations with all members of the governments of the CIS countries. I consider that our government is doing the right thing and will further continue cooperation with the CIS countries. But Russia, like other countries, protects its own national interests first and foremost, and this is only logical. [passage omitted]

The Ministry of Finances together with the National Bank of Ukraine, the Ministry of the Economy, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, including the appropriate local bodies, checked 176 municipal and rayon branches of the National Bank of Ukraine and also procurement organizations, collectives, and state farms. The specific correctness of using credit received for advancing [word indistinct] of agricultural produce to state resources in 1993 was checked. The handing out of these advances at the beginning of April helped to conclude agreements almost in full for the delivery of grain, oil crops, and sugar beet according to the state orders. At this time in 1992, only a little more than half of the agreements were concluded. Therefore, the peasants momentarily assessed such serious and timely financial help from the government as a basis for normal relations, when there was no need to deceive the state or hide products and they could calmly accept these practically futures contracts. Everybody wishing to make a profit has grabbed, like wolves, the honest peasants' credits. [passage omitted]

Considerable credit resource funds have been used for transfers to deposit accounts, which, again, is convenient for our bankers. [passage omitted] As our revision demonstrated, the use of concessionary agricultural credits in practice is very often not connected with the conduct of spring field work and other work in guaranteeing the harvest for 1993. It is probably not by chance that last year Ukraine did not gather more than a quarter of the agricultural produce at a time when the financial state of farms was improving incessantly and left only 31 loss making farms in the entire state.

I do not know whether the agrarians understand that such shameless anarchy and the use of state financial resources will sooner or later lead to the public discrediting of credit assistance for the countryside. Innocent peasants who are working like hard- labor prisoners in the fields are suffering from this and do not even guess as to all these intrigues taking place behind their backs.

Do you realize that in a civilized country the Bank of Ukraine would have been severely punished for a similar anarchy of lack of control and would have been further deprived of the right to allow state credits to pass through it in such an adventurous way? Banks are punished for this in the so-called wild, inhumane West. Incidentally, during a fall in the national currency unit of more than 10 percent, the currency exchange in a civilized country stops trading and goes for advice to the parliament and the government about the nation's fate. I am sure that here individual owners of the Bank of Ukraine's shares will tomorrow get a credit line for the irresponsible bank, but in that case the noble shareholders of the National Bank of Ukraine and not the government should take upon themselves the responsibility of the state of the economy.

As Professor Heyt's research has shown, the banking system of Ukraine is directly interested in our economy's depreciation insofar as the operating mechanism permits the great mass of money that appears during an increase in the next inflationary spiral to directly transfer the profits of banks. Here are the banking statistics. Please listen. During January and February 1993 the profit of Ukraine's industry amounted to 863 billion karbovantsi. The profit of banks amounted to 463 billion karbovantsi ie., 54 percent of industrial profits. It is characteristic that in the nine months of 1992 this figure was 12 percent. [passage omitted] I could still understand the non-interference by the National Bank in this abnormal economic intrigue if the banks were to invest these profits in the Ukrainian economy. But, unfortunately, there are few patriotic bankers in Ukraine. The banks channeled precisely these profits into dollar conversions at the rate of 3,000 Karbovantsi to one dollar, and by doing so finally finished off the economy in the conditions of an acute energy crisis. [passage omitted]

We will be in a state of chronic inflation until such time as we introduce an economic mechanism that would include taxing the excess profits of banks in order to replenish producers' circulation funds. As the economic experience of this world shows, at every subsequent twist of the inflationary spiral the number of social victims only increases. If, in this period that we are in now, metallurgists workers, miners, and transport workers are again going to argue among themselves for several months about wage levels, while the bankers swindle all of us calmly and without twisting the knife, then it is better to call early elections, at all levels, right now and let the people elect more suitable leaders.

So I expect serious support on the part of people's deputies for my proposal—the National Bank needs to be transferred to the composition of the cabinet of ministers for this extraordinary period, leaving the chairman of the National Bank under the same constitutional conditions as the minister of finance for this time.

I am certain that we will manage to cooperate with Viktor Andreyevich Yushchenko [National Bank chairman of the board]. This is a qualified and decent person. But on his own, in the existing situation, he will simply become the latest victim of his post. Such a large number of people feed on that money, going from one neighboring plant to another in that same city of Kiev for a whole month, that the chairman of the National Bank would not be able to handle it on his own. We need to counteract the negative tendency of one team.

When at the beginning of my speech I complimented us all because the capitalists have borrowed three things from us—the first is planning, the second is the high social protection, and the third is a system of tough sharing of income for the benefit of the poorest—everyone probably thought that we no longer have anything even to lend them. What kind of centralization can we talk about when the other day, in HOLOS UKRAINY [VOICE OF UKRAINE], my fellow countryman [Supreme Council Deputy] Barabash demanded some kind of privatization, or even an account for poor privatization, from the government, without realizing that Mr. Pryadko [chairman of the State Property Fund] is in the Supreme Council's backroom [pidsobka] with his State Property Fund and the right to handle that property? When even such a competent people's deputy is confused about the competence of the Supreme Council and the government, no wonder Pryadko himself often comes to me and asks to make him and the fund part of the cabinet of ministers. Or shall we leave it as it is, pulling in opposite directions?

It would be a good idea if the Supreme Council would not economize after all based on the speeches of local president's representatives and heads of local councils in today's debate. Because we, with our purely political

Kiev pettifoggery, have so confused all the local leaders that they will soon start simply electing an ataman [chieftain] or an aksakal [elder] among themselves for a certain period.

I cannot understand, for example, who is responsible today for the state of affairs in every region. In my opinion, and I have held this position since 13 October last year, local councils must remain the foundation of people's power and democracy, while regional state administrations must work in the same harness with the government during the crisis in the economy. I don't know, for instance, who can really be called to account today for the failed sowing campaign in some regions, for four-liter milk yields. I am holding [Agriculture and Food Minister] Karasyk and Demyanov [deputy prime minister for issues of the agro-industrial complex] responsible for these things all the time, but who can they call to account? As I understand, the president does not deal with the sowing or weeding in the fields. This should be handled by the cabinet of ministers. The management tools in Ukraine's cabinet of ministers have remained the same as they were in the Union. One needs only to divide fairly the former functions of the Central Committee and the Union Council of Ministers. It is one of these two things: either one sows wheat by himself right in Hrushevskyy street [the location of the parliament and the cabinet of ministers] and sends heads of departments and ministers to reap it, or, esteemed deputies, give us the levers of management at least down to the level of the regions. The president has already supported these objective problems of the cabinet of ministers, now we would like to get the Supreme Council's support.

I would like to say that the economic reform today has a political complexion. Is the work done to prevent unemployment or inflation a political issue only? Political instability not only stands in the way of foreign investors, but also in the way of the normal functioning of the economy. The country needs a strong executive power. It cannot be established on its own. The parliament's support is required. I also ask you to permit subordination of the Demonopolization Committee, the State Property Fund, and local state administrations, not because I am itching to summon [word indistinct] from the regions and give them a dressing down, but on the contrary, I propose to think about the admission of the president's representatives to the composition of the cabinet of ministers. Centralized control and planning under present-day conditions should not strangle economic freedom and initiative of a specific department or region. Believe me, the government still has enough resources today to support progressive oblasts and cities in a large and concrete manner in the cause of fulfilling the consolidated program of reforms. However, at present opposite functions are assigned to the regions and the cabinet of ministers even by law. I think during the period of instability and crisis, if we really want to manage the economy, an end must be put to this uncertainty. [passage omitted]

At present we see the main tasks of the government's regional policies in setting up a mechanism of balancing the interests of regions on a nation-wide scale and ensuring the transfer of the maximum plenary powers from Kiev to the regions. Another thing is that we must create a normal management vertical line—from Kiev to the regions—before transferring plenary powers to the regions. It is not a question of a diktat, but a question of order in economy. [passage omitted]

As you see, the government and I, the prime minister, again have to appeal to you, esteemed deputies, for support and powers. In this chamber in April I spoke of a special regime for the management of the economy: subordination of the National Bank, the Demonopolization Committee, and the State Property Fund to the government, dual subordination of the local state administrations, and the right of the cabinet of ministers to issue decrees until 18 May 1994. This, from my point of view, is the necessary minimum of components of a special management regime that will give Ukraine's economy a chance.

I shall now enumerate the government's most topical problems for the near future. First of all, there is the energy crisis and inflation. Psychologically we are accustomed to the fact that we are very wealthy, but in fact that is not true. Ukraine has a steady negative trade balance with the CIS countries and especially Russia. And the reasons for that are on the whole clear. Even while trading with Russia, which is very similar to us, we are using our potential very irrationally. In particular, supplies of especially energy intensive ferrous metallurgy commodities from Ukraine to Russia in 1992 exceeded equivalent supplies from Russia to Ukraine five-fold. The Russians, as are some of the other CIS countries, are extracting energy resources that add up to $9.5 billion of the $12 billion worth of products Russia is planning to supply to Ukraine this year by the interstate agreements alone. [sentence as heard]

In these conditions, we will not be able to provide multi-channel supplies of Ukraine's energy resources from today's mass of commodity output. We will have to seriously work on attracting foreign investors to the Ukrainian economy and sharply reduce energy consumption in the whole of the national economy—we must particularly reduce gas consumption by 25 billion cubic meters per year.

Energy consumption per capita in 1991 amounted to around 4,600 kg of conventional fuel, which is higher than the indices determined even by West European standards. At the same time in 1990 we spent an average of 60 percent more energy per unit of output than the Europeans. Tactically, we will have to resort to both strict administrative restrictions and tax pressure. Strategically, we are saved only by the high-rate production processes in the industry for which we have adequate scientific, technological, and cultural potential. Under the influence of the energy crisis, patriotic Americans were once forced to swap huge Fords for more economical Toyotas and give up beef and pork for three times more energy efficient broiler chickens. Using plasma in steel production cuts energy spending in half for each ton. We will have to learn these and similar things in the near future.

It is necessary to add the following to the government's traditional, already six-month-old, anti-inflationary and stabilizing actions. A purge should be conducted of enterprises deepest in debt, and these bankrupt enterprises should be singled out in a special administrative regime. As to other enterprises, a string of measures should be urgently worked out and implemented to replenish circulation funds, using, among other things, property collateral. Housing privatization should be quickly developed. A national contractor company should be set up that should replace the administrative distribution of raw resources, using, among other things, future markets [fyucherni kontrakty]. Corporatization of enterprises should be conducted. New economic companies [tovarystva] should be created on the basis of corporatized state enterprises and private firms. Domestic private investors should be given the right to finance local state sectoral programs down to the programs for single state enterprises with the reception of a respective share of profits from the results of their investments. State enterprises should be allowed to set up financial, investment, and holding companies or groups together with domestic and foreign companies. A national agency for investments and concessions should be set up. There is enough of such specific steps accumulated in the government's arsenal. Life prompts something new all the time. To me, as a practical man, such concrete steps, brought to implementation, are even more important than the so-called market program. [passage omitted]

First, wide-scale involvement of private initiative in the economy by way of implementing a two-year plan of the destatization of the industry and agricultural reform. Second, a tough credit policy in the state, whereby high credit interest rates filter out effective investments and promotes the stability of the national currency unit, prices, and wages. Third, small and middle privatization must yield this year the 650 billion karbovantsi that we planned in this year's state budget. Fourth, the liberalization of external trade must renew and expand drastically Ukraine's export capacity and promote an influx of hard currency resources and high technology into Ukraine. Fifth, the reform of the banking system must be aimed at creating a whole network of powerful commercial banks with rules of fair market play, legal capital, and a sound international reputation, as well as provide the introduction of the hryvna. Sixth, the market transformation from traditional to Ukrainian industry manufacturers must include accelerated technical modernization with the involvement of foreign investments and reorientation toward exportable output. Seventh, the creation of all the necessary market infrastructure in the state including those pilot projects for the ruble and the hard currency zones, free economic zones, and concessions. And, finally, eighth: Guaranteed and clearly differentiated, according to the social strata, protection of the interests of Ukraine's interests during the implementation of the reform; creation of serious economic incentives for honest labor; and protection of the individual's rights in the face of cardinal transformations in the economy.

Starting their reforms, the Japanese said: Fall seven times, but rise eight times. I am deeply convinced that our people will have enough strength and intelligence to make use of this advice. It is important never to forget the purpose with which we embarked on the reforms. We embarked on them with the sole purpose of improving the people's lives and providing our countrymen with conditions on a par with the world standards of labor and consumption. All present in this chamber today, in one way or another, had something to do with the choice we made having started the restructuring and then having declared Ukraine's independence. In such cases, I think, one should go by the rule: If afraid, don't do it. But once you do it, don't be afraid. May the apocalypse of disorder taking place in some of the CIS countries prompt us all to start upon the revival of Ukraine's quality economy in harmony and with renewed strength. If we fail, the fate of Ukraine as a state could be at stake. Let us do our duty to the people and then success will await us. Thank you for your attention, I hope for your support and cooperation.

Belarus

Shushkevich Addresses Supreme Soviet 19 May

WS1905140093 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0918 GMT 19 May 93

[Address by Supreme Soviet chairman Stanislav Shushkevich to the 12th Supreme Soviet session in Minsk; broadcast in progress—live]

[Text] The Constitutional Committee has drafted the constitution on the basis of a professional analysis of all the remarks expressed by both the people's deputies and by citizens in the course of the all-national discussion.

The document submitted for your consideration consists of a preface, eight sections, nine chapters, and 153 articles. Its composition has been determined by the concept of the priority of an individual, his rights and freedoms. This is why the new constitution begins with these principles, and is based on them. This will be a document of direct action. It will help the citizens of the Republic defend their rights being backed by the constitution. Aside from this, the document stipulates a radical change of all the branches of the state administration system.

Now I would like to analyze the concrete provisions of the draft law and the recently introduced changes. With regard to remarks and recommendations, a new section has been entered in the document—On State Control and Supervision. It is composed of the following chapters: the Constitutional Court, the Prosecution, and the new chapter on the Control Chamber. The preface has not undergone any substantial changes. There have been proposals to exclude from the preamble references to the Charter of the Great Lithuanian Principality, the Russian [word indistinct], charters of the Belarusian People's Republic, and the Constitution of Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic. If the references to the historic acts of Belarus were excluded from the preamble, this would make the constitution devoid of respect toward the revival of Belarusian statehood. Thus, the preamble determines the main goals and ideas of the constitution.

The question may arise: What kind of state are we building? The draft document does not contain words like socialist and Soviet. We suggest that no ideology be granted national status. Article I underlines the social orientation of our state and the importance of public and social interests in the process of building the state.

The section entitled the Basis of the Constitutional System drafts the basis for the existence of the society, individuals, and the state. These are: national sovereignty, rule by the people, acknowledgement of man being of the utmost value of the society and the state, and acknowledgement of the entire nation as the sole source of state power [words indistinct] the priority of international legal norms. Article 17 grants the Belarusian language the status of national language, and stipulates that the status of other languages will be determined by the law. Along with this, Article 50 states that every person has a right to use his native language and choose his language of communication. I would like the Supreme Soviet to be unanimous in the cause of reviving the Belarusian language, which has suffered severe repression over a period of almost two centuries, especially in recent times. I would like us to adopt an approach granting every citizen the right to use his native language and obliging him to respect the language of the state, the language of our fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors.

The section on rights and freedoms of citizens entitled Individual, Society, State is the core of the draft constitution. This chapter grants constitutional status to human values, rights, and freedoms in the Republic of Belarus. It consecrates such absolute and inviolable human rights as the right to life, liberty, the inviolability of human dignity, freedom to travel and choose a place of residence, freedom of views and persuasions, and the right to freely express them. The document also drafts the economic, social, and cultural rights of the citizens. But we should keep in mind that these rights are very closely related to our economic situation. So far, they have rather reflected what we are striving for.

We have received a large number of remarks and recommendations with regard to articles dealing with citizens' rights for education and medical care. After the completion of these articles, we have strengthened state guarantees for medical care and education. It has been stated that citizens are granted free medical care in state medical institutions, as well as access to and a free-of-charge status for compulsory education, whose level will be determined by the law. Aside from this, everyone has a right to receive vocational, secondary, and higher education at state educational institutions.

Section Three, entitled the Electoral System and the Referendum, comprehensively reflects the principles and procedures for electing deputies and other officials of state administration by the people, as well as the principles of holding local and national referendums.

Section Four of the document submitted for your consideration, dealing with legislative, executive, and judicial power, has undergone most radical changes. This is clear. The Belarusian Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on 5 February 1993 on the draft constitution of the Republic of Belarus. The resolution states that the Supreme Soviet is the supreme organ of state administration. Some of its deputies may work there on a permanent basis, while others combine their legislative activity with performing economic or official duties. Belarus is a republic in which the president is the head of the executive power. The 10th session discussed the draft constitution which was based on the idea of a parliamentary republic. Today we have a draft document envisioning a presidential republic. I expressed my attitude toward this decision in my report at the 11th session. The choice between a parliamentary and a presidential state cannot be based on abstract things like the choice between two ideas. We have a material implementation of these ideas in the form of two draft constitutions. However, notwithstanding all the discrepancies with regard to the presidency, Section Four has been completed, taking into consideration the 5 February Supreme Soviet resolution. I would even say it was thoroughly completed in accordance with the results of (?rating voting). Our legislature has been determined by the draft constitution as the supreme representative and the only lawmaking organ. It is composed of 240 deputies elected by Belarusian citizens for a period of five years. The powers of the Supreme Soviet have been specified in the course of the draft's completion.

Section Five deals with the Cabinet of Ministers as being the Government of the Republic of Belarus. It stipulates that the prime minister is the head of the government, while other members of the government will be appointed and dismissed by the president. The prime minister, the foreign minister, the finance, defense, and interior ministers, and the State Security Committee chairman are appointed by the president and approved by the Supreme Soviet. This procedure will make for a larger independence of the executive power.

The Court section is based on the concept of division of powers. It stipulates independence of judges during the performance of their duties, and their subordination to the law. Justice will be achieved on the basis of [word indistinct] and equality of the sides at the trial, open hearing of cases in all the courts, and the like. It is envisaged that judicial power in the Republic belongs to the Court and the judicial system is determined by the law.

The system of local administration is now undergoing a reformation process. The section dealing with local administration and self-rule says that local administration is carried out through local self-rule organs, local referendums, citizens' gatherings and other forms of direct participation of citizens in public affairs. Local representative organs are elected by citizens in accordance with the administrative and territorial division, for a period of four years.

I would like to inform you that there have been a lot of proposals regarding the Local Administration and Self-Rule section. Some of them, put forward by law-making organs and individuals, have been enclosed to the draft. We must submit all recommendations to a businesslike analysis and decide what should be accepted or rejected.

The State Control and Supervision section determines the activity of organs charged with control and supervision on behalf of the state.

The seventh section entitled Financial System has been altered in accordance with remarks and recommendations.

The last section of the constitution the Functioning of the Belarusian Constitution and the Procedure for Its Alteration has not tangibly changed since its completion.

Along with the draft constitution, the draft law on the procedure of the enactment the Belarusian Constitution has been submitted for your consideration. It is stipulated that the draft constitution comes into effect on the day of its publication. There are certain exceptions with regard to separate provisions that come into effect in terms determined by the law. The day the new constitution comes into force, the 1978 Belarusian Constitution loses its validity along with all the later changes and amendments. The norms of the constitutional law, the National Sovereignty Declaration, will be used only if they do not contradict the Constitution of the Republic of Belarus. The Law On Enactment of the Belarusian Constitution determines the procedure for adopting the laws stipulated by the constitution, as well as the conditions of activity of laws and other legal acts in the period prior to bringing them into concord with the constitution. It is expedient to determine the dates of presidential and Supreme Soviet elections. It should also be stated that officials elected or appointed by the 12th Supreme Soviet will keep their powers for a period of time determined by the law.

In accordance with point three of the procedure for completing the work on the new constitution of the Republic of Belarus, remarks and recommendations have been generalized by the Constitutional Committee's working group. On the basis of the proposals on the side of lawmaking organs and individuals, an explanatory note has been drafted and enclosed to the draft constitution.

Esteemed deputies! We made a decision to draft a new constitution almost three years ago. The Belarusian Supreme Soviet stands a good chance of adopting the constitution. It also has the necessary legislative experience to do this work well. Missing this opportunity and leaving the constitutional question unresolved, would be inadmissible.

Tajikistan

Russian Forces To Help Clear Border Town of 'Militants'

LD1905140293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1334 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe May 19 TASS—The government of Tajikistan armed forces in a joint action with the Russian frontier guards have completely cleared the border town of Redjov of armed militant groups of the Islamic opposition.

According to the Russian frontier guard headquarteres, some of the militants were liquidated in armed encounters, while others succeeded in escaping across the border.

As previouly reported, large-scale border violations on the Shuro-Abad sector occurred at the beginning of May, when a group of over 300 militants penetrated the territory of the Shuro-Abad district.

Commanders of the military operation gave the tresspassers the opportunity to surrender in order to avoid bloodshed and a large number of casualties, but it was turned down by the militants who, apparently, counted upon help from their like- minded people in the northern provinces of Afghanistan.

According to the Russian frontier guard command, the situation in this area is comparatively stable. Border patrols are carrying out operational measures to check Redjov village and its outskirts. There are reports that the militants might have left arms hidden in secret places and mined mountain trails leading to border check posts.

Prime Minister Views Flood Damage, Border Situation

PM1905153393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 93 p 1

[Interview with A.A. Abdulladzhanov, Council of Ministers chairman, by Igor Lenskiy in Moscow; date not given: "War Not Yet Washed Away"]

[Text] You would not wish such a fate on your enemy. Having barely survived a civil war, it looks as if Tajikistan will find itself on the verge of a new conflict—an external one. In the meantime there has been another blow—a blow by the pitiless elements. I met A. Abdulladzhanov, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, in the foyer of the President Hotel. This is what he said specially for PRAVDA:

[Lenskiy] Abdumalik Abdullayevich, is it possible yet to judge definitely the consequences of the natural disaster?

[Abdulladzhanov] There has been colossal destruction, with damage estimated at 129 billion rubles. Some 8,200 private houses with outbuildings, approximately 120 bridges, 140 schools and preschool establishments, and 150 production and administrative buildings were swept away. A mudflow washed away more than 120,000 hectares of cotton, 80,000 orchards and vineyards, and thousands of head of cattle. You can infer from this how much of everything we need. Starting with medical supplies and food and ending with construction materials and equipment.

[Lenskiy] What about loss of life?

[Abdulladzhanov] Just one girl died. Fortunately, we managed to warn and evacuate people. But tens of thousands have been made homeless.

[Lenskiy] Tajikistan is channeling the main effort into restoring the economy in the south of the republic, which suffered most as a result of the civil war. Are your fellow countrymen from Leninabad not jealous?

[Abdulladzhanov] On the contrary, it is primarily they who are helping. In addition to participating in the rebuilding of housing, all northern cities and rayons have pledged to open branches and subsidiary production facilities of their major enterprises in the south.

[Lenskiy] How is the return of refugees from Afghanistan proceeding?

[Abdulladzhanov] Up to 1,500 are returning every day. The refugees are at once given one-shot assistance, long-term credit, construction materials, and plots of land. After that, let them rely on their own efforts... Some 20,000-25,000 of our compatriots will still remain in Afghanistan, no more than that.

[Lenskiy] Can the civil war be considered to be over?

[Abdulladzhanov] There are virtually no hotbeds of resistance anywhere in the republic. Combat operations are taking place against mujahidin on the border in four or five places. They break through, and we beat them back.

[Lenskiy] Have the CIS countries fulfilled their pledges to strengthen the Tajik-Afghan border?

[Abdulladzhanov] Russia and Uzbekistan have, while Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan have not yet done so. But they promise, any time now...

[Lenskiy] Is there a danger of aggression from the other side of the border?

[Abdulladzhanov] There are many signs that a general offensive is being prepared at the end of May. A useless venture, and nothing will come of it all the same. Only it is a pity, for there will be lots of casualties if there is war again.

UN Special Envoy Visits, Discusses Refugee Problem

LD1805151893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1401 GMT 18 May 93

[By KHOVAR news agency for TASS]

[Text] Dushanbe May 18 TASS—"The problem of return of Tajik refugees to places of permanent residence has been practically resolved in our country," first deputy head of the Tajik parliament Abdumadzhid Dostiyev, said today at a meeting with a special envoy of the U.N. secretary general Ismat Kittani, who arrived in Dushanbe.

"Over 600,000 people, who were forcibly resettled as a result of last year's armed conflict in the country, have returned to their homes already," Dostiyev said.

He said that as a result of efforts made by the parliamentary commission for the return of refugees, a great number of refugees who had fled to Afghanistan are expected to cross the Afghan-Tajik border in the next few days in order to return to their native places.

Turkmenistan

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev Visits, Talks With Niyazov

LD1905152493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1319 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Kazakhstani President Nursultan Nazarbayev is continuing his visit to Turkmenistan. Our correspondent, Yergin Amanov, has the details.

[Amanov] The Turkmen-Kazakhstani talks continued today in Ashgabat. They began with a meeting between Presidents Saparmurad Niyazov and Nursultan Nazarbayev. The main result of the meeting was the signing of the first Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the Republic of Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Today, eight documents were signed, including intergovernmental agreements on transport and communications, oil and gas industry, and security. The Internal Affairs Ministries have also signed an agreement on fighting crime. An agreement on how to resolve economic disputes between the two states was also signed. The protocol on the implementation of an intergovernmental agreement on trade and economic cooperation for 1993 was also signed.

Assessing the results of the talks at a press conference for journalists, Nursultan Nazarbayev said in particular:

[Begin Nazarbayev recording] Our economies are linked. If an agreement on joint extraction, processing, and transport of oil and gas is signed, this will be an act of great importance for both states and it will have a worldwide echo. We have appealed to all states with regard to the problem of the Caspian Sea, and proposed to the states of the basin to convene this autumn in order to resolve the problems of biological resources of the Caspian Sea, its borders, and ecology. During this meeting, the Republic of Turkmenistan decided to participate in setting up a fund on problems of the Aral Sea. Transport ministers will sign documents. Agreements have been reached on all topics.

We also talked about political matters, problems of the CIS, and, of course, about the relationships between the Central Asian states. I believe that we hold the same opinion on a broad range of topics: such as geopolitical problems and worldwide conflict situations. Thus, I can declare to you that the Kazakhstan side is fully satisfied and is deeply thankful for the brotherly reception, warm welcome, and friendship. Personally, I value very highly my own relationship with President Niyazov. In very difficult conditions, he and his brothers in arms are doing everything for the well-being of their people. So, we call for the respect for the capabilities of everyone, the non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, and the consolidation of friendly ties based on historical roots—Kazakhs and Turkmens have the same roots, we used to be one people, one culture, one destiny, one history. Our aim is to transmit these good relations to our descendants. [end recording]

[Amanov] Tomorrow morning, Presidents Saparmurad Niyazov and Nursultan Nazarbayev will visit Balkan Oblast where they will discuss question of the ecological situation on the Caspian Sea, talk to locals, and visit Kazakh families. After that, President Nazarbayev will fly back home.

[Moscow ITAR-TASS in English at 1646 GMT on 19 May adds: "The visit by Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev to Turkmenistan has helped bring the positions of leaders of both countries closer together, the Kazakh and Turkmen presidents said at a news conference today, held after final documents had been signed.

["'Our views on problems and a mechanism of cooperation in the framework of the CIS, as on all other geopolitical and world problems, including regional ones, fully coincide,' the Kazakh president said. 'By the importance of cooperation we mean close economic cooperation on the basis of priorities in the division of labour and the observation of guarantees of complete independence and sovereignty,' Nazarbayev said.

["Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov has confirmed the readiness to respect all ways leading to the development of business partnership between all CIS countries. He said that their task was to look for optimal ways of cooperation in future, which would ensure peace and welfare for their people."]

Armenia

Top Georgian Leaders Arrive To Sign Friendship Accord

LD1905095993 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0800 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] According to the CONTACT NEWS AGENCY, this morning, 19 May, the Georgian state delegation led by Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, flew to the capital of Armenia, Yerevan.

The delegation consists of Georgian Prime Minister Tenghiz Sigua, Deputy Parliament Speaker Vakhtang Rcheulishvili, Foreign Affairs Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze, and heads of Georgia's ministries and establishments.

It is a one-day visit and the heads of the two neighboring states, Georgian head of state Eduard Shevardnadze and Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, will sign an agreement on friendship, cooperation, and mutual security between Georgia and Armenia. Other very important agreements will also be signed. They will cover the further deepening and widening of economic and cultural relations between the two countries.

The meeting of the two countries' leaders is important in many ways, and this fact makes this visit a historic event.

First, by signing the agreement on friendship, cooperation, and mutual security, Georgia, in fact, ends the first stage of its foreign policy formation and establishes equal and legal relations with every immediate neighboring state except Russia, with which negotiations are being continued. Second, our country is continuing to carry out the idea of resolving regional conflicts in the Caucasus by activating the Caucasus factor. This idea was proposed by the head of the state of Georgia and the first steps were taken in the capital of Azerbaijan, Baku, and then, during the meeting in the capital of Turkey, Ankara.

Friendship Treaty Signed

LD1905160693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1346 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] We have already reported that talks were held in Yerevan today between Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of Georgia's State Council, and Levon Ter-Petrosyan, president of the Republic of Armenia. Here with the details is Zurab Dvali, an IPRINDA agency correspondent.

[Dvali] Georgian Head of State Eduard Shevardnadze and Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan have signed a treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual security. The ceremony took place in a solemn atmosphere in the House of Government Guests in Yerevan at about 1500, following the conclusion of talks between the government delegations of Armenia and Georgia. An agreement on cooperation between the Georgian Parliament and the Armenian Supreme Soviet was also signed. Apart from that, a whole package of agreements on cooperation in coordinating land and air communications, customs relations, and an agreement on through carriage were also signed. A decision was taken to open a customs checkpoint on the border between the two adjacent republics. One should probably also single out the agreement on cooperation between law-enforcement bodies of Armenia and Georgia, and on combating drugs trafficking and other offenses. On the whole, the package of treaties covers virtually all spheres of relations between the two republics.

Following the signing of these documents, the heads of state of the two republics held a short news conference for journalists. At this briefing Eduard Shevardnadze, head of the Georgian delegation, reported that he was satisfied with the results of his visit to Yerevan. Important treaties and agreements were signed. He also said that the sides have agreed to set up a special mixed commission to take control over transport communications linking Georgia and Armenia. This commission will also control the gas pipeline through which fuel is supplied to Armenia. As is known, there have been frequent instances of sabotage on this facility which is so important for the Armenian Republic.

Answering a journalist's question, Shevardnadze once again reaffirmed that Georgia has no intention of joining the CIS. Incidentally, at the meeting with the press it also became known that the two leaders have agreed on the advisability of holding such contacts twice a year, irrespective of where they might be held, Yerevan or Tbilisi.

Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan reacted in a positive way to the role of the Georgian side in the process of normalizing Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, and singled out in this connection his meeting in Ankara with Abdulfaz Elchibey, the Azerbaijani president, under the mediation of Eduard Shevardnadze. The very fact that Georgia has signed an agreement on friendship and cooperation with Azerbaijan, and now with Armenia, gives hope for a settlement to the situation in the whole region, Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan stressed.

Shevardnadze Suggests Caucasian Peacemaking Mission

LD1905190693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 19 May 93

[By correspondent N. Kandiashvili, including recorded remarks by Georgian Head of State Shevardnadze, from Yerevan—from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, arrived in Yerevan today on an official visit. He was met at the airport by Mr. Levon Ter-Petrosyan, president of Armenia, and other officials. The cavalcade went to the residence of the Armenian president where the leaders of the two states had talks. At the same time, the prime ministers and heads of a number of ministries held meetings in various offices where they finalized the details of more than 20 important treaties between Georgia and Armenia signed in Yerevan today. Among others, Shevardnadze and Ter-Petrosyan signed an agreement on friendship, cooperation, and mutual security measures between the two countries. An almost identical package of treaties was very recently signed in Baku between Georgia and Azerbaijan.

Eduard Shevardnadze today touched on the subject—for the first time, it seems—of a peace-making mission of the three Transcaucasian republics in the Transcaucasus itself.

[Shevardnadze] It is precisely the Caucasian factor that we have been unable to bring into play so far—I mean the potential of the three states in making peace, the peacemaking potential of the three states. The same good and proper documents will also be signed by Armenia and Azerbaijan, and this will ensure peace and stability in our region.

Russia To Ensure Gas Supplies

PM1905150993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 May 93 First Edition p 7

[Karen Topchyan report: "Most Favored Nation Status"]

[Text] Yerevan—Recent events demonstrate that Russia is the only country that has shown a sincere interest in coming to the aid of Armenia, which finds itself in a disastrous situation. The latest example of this attitude on Moscow's part is a document that has been signed on establishing permanent working groups to coordinate issues of fuel supplies to Armenia.

Armenia, which is blockaded on all sides and moreover does not have enough energy supplies of its own, is in desperate need of fuel.

Government Press Service Director V. Manoyan stated that "regarding supplies of oil products to Armenia, our Russian partners are continuing to explore the most favorable terms: Our country's accounts in Moscow are possibly the only ones belonging to the former union republics that have not been frozen. Terms have been established enabling Russian oil products to be paid for using goods manufactured in our country."

Under the document that has been signed, Russia is committed to take measures to settle the issue of delivering natural gas to Armenia. The case in point concerns supplying blue fuel, which is not arriving here in full because of Georgia's illegal "appropriation" of some of the quota destined for Armenia.

Government To Respond to Peace Plan 26 May

LD1905184993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1658 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan May 19 TASS—Russia plays a positive and constructive role in the Karabakh conflict settlement, Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan told ITAR-TASS here today.

He stressed this stand is shown by Russia at all international forums and in the CSCE Minsk process and recalled Russia together with the United States and Turkey has put forward an initiative to offer a new schedule for the Karabakh settlement.

The document was received in Armenia on Tuesday, said the president. The official response will be made public on May 26. Ter-Petrosyan did not disclose details of Yerevan stand on the new variant of the tripartite initiative.

Students Demonstrate Against Turkey

LD1905164693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Today in Yerevan in a square near the university 2,500 students held an unsanctioned meeting. At the meeting they protested against Turkey's interference in the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. The principal of the university did not allow them to hold the meeting but when the meeting, nevertheless, took place he expressed his support for the position of his students.

Azerbaijan

Baku Reportedly Not To Join CIS Economic Zone

NC1905142193 Baku TURAN in English 0851 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Baku, May 19 (TURAN)—Two vice-prime ministers of the Republic Vakhid Akhmedov and Abbas Abbasov declared, that Azerbaijan wouldn't join the CIS common economic zone.

Vakhid Akhmedov consider, that CIS economic zone propose to create the common tax system, that contradicts independent economic policy of the Republic. According to Abbas Abbasov view, the pact of cooperation proposals, submitted for the discussion of the leaders of CIS states in Moscow on May 14, has a number of unfavourable for Azerbaijan moments.

Such announcements of two vice-prime ministers sound sensational on the background of that the president of Azerbaijan himself and the chairman of the Parliament noted the necessity of the Republic to join the CIS economic zone.

Agreement Between Nakhichevan, Armenia Called 'Betrayal'

NC1905140393 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 1046 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Baku, 19 May (ASSA-IRADA)—Signing of formal documents between Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic [NAR] and Armenia is considered by Tamerlan Karayev; the first vice speaker of parliament, to be a betrayal of people's interests, reported ASSA-IRADA parliamentary correspondent. Heavy debates at Milli Mejlis were caused by the meeting of NAR parliament speaker Geydar Aliyev with the Armenian mission in the border zone, May 14. There the participants discussed the issue on providing security and stability in all the border zones between NAR and Armenia. Parliament divided: Some MPs criticized the attempt of Autonomous Republic to act as if it were an independent state, others considered it a way out of the situation arisen in Nakhichevan and highly appreciated extension of links between Nakhichevan, on one hand, and Iran and Turkey, on the other. Due to this 350 thousand population of NAR is provided with foodstuffs, everyday goods, fuel etc. speaker of Azerbaijani parliament Isa Kamberov called the MPs not to make hasty conclusions when the issue is Geydar Aliyev's actions.

Nagorno-Karabakh Opposed to Turkey as Mediator

LD1905163593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1400 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] A briefing was held in Stepanakert today devoted to the Russo-Turkish-U.S. plan for settling the Karabakh conflict. Gukasyan, advisor to the chairman of the State Defense Committee on Foreign Policy, stated that Turkey's approach is destructive and that the authorities of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic are not happy having Turkey as a mediator. Gukasyan confirmed the Karabakh leadership's readiness to enter direct, unconditional talks with Azerbaijan.

Kulizade Welcomes Schedule for Ending Conflict

OW2005075193 Baku Azerbaycan Radio Televiziyasi Television Network in Russian 1500 GMT 19 May 93

[From the "Telefaks" newscast]

[Text] Vefa Kulizade, state secretary of Azerbaijan, declared: I have a positive attitude toward the more precise schedule of urgent measures for normalizing the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, worked out by the representatives of Turkey, the United States, and Russia at the 14-15 May meeting in Moscow. In my opinion this opens up the possibility of continuing the negotiating process in the framework of the CSCE Minsk conference held in Minsk. I suppose that this time Armenia will be forced to adopt and implement the more precise schedule since it will want to avoid confrontation with prestigious countries and world public opinion.

Cooperation Agreement Signed With Russia

NC2005100193 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Rauf Aliyev, Azerbaijan's deputy representative in Moscow for economic affairs, has informed a KHABER SERVICE NEWS AGENCY correspondent that Russia and Azerbaijan on 18 May signed an agreement in Moscow on cooperation in the machinery engineering field. Aliyev said that Azerbaijan was represented in the talks by Deputy Economy Ministers [name indistinct] Ekperov and Salih Aliyev. The agreement also provides for supplying raw materials to the factories in our Republic. It will create an opportunity to restore relations between the two sides, which have been suspended since the USSR's disintegration.

Guseynov, Iranian Ambassador Discuss Cooperation

NC2005071493 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0230 GMT 20 May 93

[Text] The Iranian ambassador in Baku met and talked with Azerbaijani Prime Minister Panakh Guseynov last night. The Central News Unit reports from Baku that during this meeting, our ambassador informed the Azerbaijani prime minister of Iran's readiness to implement industrial-economic projects in Azerbaijan.

Guseynov also stressed the need to expand joint activities such as constructing factories, repairing equipment, and transferring technology from Iran and added: Due to plans to jointly exploit Azerbaijan's oil and petrochemical resources, gas reserves, and major economic facilities, the future of Tehran-Baku cooperation is promising.

Kamberov Rejects Holding Special Supreme Soviet Session

NC1905141093 Baku TURAN in English 0851 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Baku, May 19 (TURAN)—Yesterday on the sitting of Milli Mejlis, its chairman Isa Kamberov rejected the proposal of the deputate Arif Ragim-Zade to summon a special session of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan.

This written proposal to summon a session was signed by 130 deputates. But the chairman said, that the signs were invalidity and thats why the proposal couldnt be submitted for discussion.

Earlier the guidance of Milli Mejlis called the proposal to summon a special session of the supreme soviet a coup attempt. But the deputate for the parliament A. Ragim-Zade doesnt consider that the number of deputates have for an object to remove Milli Mejlis and its chairman from the power. It concerns the serious analysis of the social, economic and foreign policy activity of the Republic authority. Ragim-Zade said that, the deputates for the parliament, elected from their duties one year ago had rights to express their opinion on these questions.

The Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan (340 deputates) was dissolved one year ago, after the failure to bring Ayaz Mutalibov back to the power. The functions of SS [Supreme Soviet] were handed over to Milli Mejlis, consisting of 50 deputates (25 'democrates' and 25 'partocrates'). At that time 'democrates' and 'partocrates' came to an agreement that Milli Mejlis wouldnt exist for a long time and would be dissolved after parliamentary elections. At the same time, the deputates ejected from their duties were guaranteed that they could summon a session of the supreme soviet any time and went in for political activity out of the parliament.

Elchibey Congratulates National Assembly on Anniversary

NC2005093493 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 18 May 93

["Text" of President Abulfaz Elchibey's congratulatory message to the National Assembly on 18 May—read by announcer]

[Text] Esteemed Deputies, 18 May is the anniversary of the establishment of the National Assembly. The National Assembly was established in accordance with the determination and will of our people three days after our victory on 15 May 1992. Ever since that symbolic day, the National Assembly has carried out important work and adopted many laws and resolutions to contribute toward establishing stability in the Republic, implementing democratic reforms, and removing the serious economic crisis. The deputies' visits to the battle zones during the grave days of the war to meet our troops and local residents has boosted our people's confidence that we will be victorious.

The National Assembly's functions are wide-ranging. Its main objective is to ensure that the people's objectives and the Republic's independence are safeguarded.

The deputies' work in international relations and their contribution toward helping the refugees and the displaced should be praised.

Esteemed Deputies, we face a significant and historic task. Settling the internal and external problems require that we maintain a determined, firm, and, above all, united stand.

I sincerely congratulate you on the occasion of the first anniversary of the National Assembly and wish you sound health and great success, particularly in the next elections. I also hope that you will continue to struggle and make sacrifices for Azerbaijan's independence.

Georgia

Government Orders Troops To Cease Fire 20 May

LD1905143993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1329 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 19 May—An order was given to Georgian troops today to cease fire in Abkhazia at midnight on 20 May. This was announced in an ITAR-TASS interview by Aleksandr Kavsadze, chairman of the Georgian State Committee for Interethnic Relations and the Protection of Human Rights. This step was taken in accordance with the communique from the Moscow meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Georgian parliament chairman Eduard Shevardnadze.

Aleksandr Kavsadze, who the day before yesterday was appointed Shevardnadze's personal and plenipotentiary representative to coordinate actions to settle conflicts in the republic, also announced that according to information at his disposal, the Gudauta administration is also taking appropriate actions to cease fire at the appointed hour.

Aleksandr Kavsadze said a consultative meeting between representatives of the warring sides has already been held. At the meeting, they outlined a plan of action to begin a process of negotiations to settle the conflict in Abkhazia. In Kavsadze's view, at least three interested parties will take part in the process, namely the Sukhumi administration, Gudauta, and Georgia's central authorities. But he also cannot rule out the possibility of involving in this process his Russia counterpart vested with the same powers, Boris Pastukhov, the Russian president's personal representative and deputy foreign minister, as well as Colonel General Aleksandr Galkin from the Russian Defense Ministry.

Aleksandr Kavsadze also said that envoy Edouard Brunner, the UN secretary general's personal representative, arrives in Tbilisi tomorrow on a special mission with the aim of settling the conflict. Kavsadze said there is a possibility that the CSCE and other international organizations might join the process.

Abkhazian Leader Orders Troops To Cease Fire

LD1905213793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 19 May 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The latest news from Abkhazia is as follows. As our correspondent Ruslan Khashig has reported, Vladislav Ardzinba, commander in chief of the armed forces of the Republic of Abkhazia, has issued an order to all subunits of the armed forces of the Republic of Abkhazia to cease fire and use of aviation and artillery on the Gumista and eastern fronts from midnight on 20 May. This was a report by our correspondent Ruslan Khashig from Abkhazia.

Both Sides Observing Cease-Fire

LD3005113693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1042 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 20 May—The Abkhazian armed formations have stopped fire as of 0000 today and are not using aviation or artillery along the line of Georgian-Abkhazian confrontation. The order was given in accordance with the Russian-Georgian accords on ceasing fire as of 20 May. A report by the Abkhazian Supreme Soviet's press service says that, early this morning the Georgian side shelled the village of Labra. The same report says that, despite the danger of a methane explosion in Tkvarcheli mines, the systematic artillery shelling of the besieged town continues.

According to reports by a GIA-TASS correspondent from Sukhumi and Ochamchira, the ceasefire agreement is being observed by both sides. Information on the consequences of the shelling of Sukhumi by Grad installations on Wednesday has been checked. The Abkhazian side fired more than 40 rocket-propelled projectiles at residential areas. Serious structural damage has been caused to houses, public buildings, and economic sites in the town center. Five people were killed and eight injured, including two children.

These data were confirmed by ITAR-TASS correspondent Irina Shchegoleva, with reference to information from the town headquarters of Abkhazian refugees in Sochi.

Shevardnadze Statement on Cease-Fire

LD2005121093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1035 GMT 20 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 20 May—"Today gives the Georgians and Abkhazians an historic chance to halt the slide toward the disaster into which this war is more and more obviously developing. If we do not make full use of this chance, the war's catastrophic consequences will affect the destiny of more than just our peoples." This was pointed out today by Georgian head Eduard Shevardnadze in a statement on the occasion of the cease-fire in Abkhazia.

"In keeping with the accords reached between me and the Russian president on 14 May this year," the statement says, "I have issued an order, coordinated with the Abkhazian Defense Council in Sukhumi, to the Georgian troops to observe a cease-fire in Abkhazia from 0000 on 20 May 1993. I welcome a similar step, taken by the Gudauta leadership, and I voice the hope that these orders will be carried out implicitly."

"The leaders of each side are obliged to ensure observance of the cease-fire terms. On the Georgian side, I am the guarantor of this, pledging to demand their categorical observance and ensuring the normal progress of the talks. On the Russian side, the guarantor is the president. We are both looking to the Gudauta leadership to implement the appropriate guarantees," Eduard Shevardnadze declared.

"The Georgians and the Abkhazians have no problems that they cannot resolve in a peaceful dialogue. The Georgian side, in the person of its highest representatives, is prepared to start a serious dialogue about how we are to live in the future," the head of Georgia noted.

Yeltsin Representatives Meet With Abkhaz Officials

LD1905151593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1430 GMT 19 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Irina Schegoleva]

[Text] Sochi May 19 TASS—First Deputy Russian Foreign Minister Boris Pastukhov has arrived in Sochi today as a special representative of the Russian president. He is accompanied by special envoy Gennadiy Fedosov and a senior official of the Russian Foreign Ministry, Andrey Avetisyan.

"We have arrived on order to inform the Abkhazian side at the request of the Russian leadership about the results of a working meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Georgian parliamentary speaker Eduard Shevarnadze, which took place in Moscow on May 14," Pastukhov told ITAR-TASS.

"Now, the settlement of the conflict will much depend on the Abkhazian position. We are encouraged by the fact that Chairman of the Abkhazian parliament Vladislav Ardzinba has positively assessed the results of the Moscow meeting. In our opinion, positive signs have appeared in the Georgian-Abkhazian relations, and they should be strengthened and developed," Pastukhov said.

Later in the day, representatives of the Russian Foreign Ministry left Sochi for Gudauta. On Thursday, they are planning to visit Sukhumi. Pastukhov said that among problems expected to be discussed with the Abkhazian leadership, are preparations for tripartite talks on the settlement of the conflict and a problem of the resumption of a humanitarian action to provide aid to peaceful civilians from Tkvarcheli and Sukhumi.

"The Russian side is prepared to carry out this action, there are only a few details to be settled yet with the Georgian and Abkhazian sides," Pastukhov said.

Defense Minister Sets Up 1st Army Corps

LD1905164093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1300 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Georgiy Karkarashvili, recently been appointed the defense minister of the Republic of Georgia, has signed his first order. This provides for the abolishment of the rapid reaction corps which is the foundation of the Georgian Army. On its basis the 1st Army Corps, which will be under the Ministry of Defense of the republic, is set up.

Shevardnadze Meets With Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister

LD1905152893 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0400 GMT 19 May 93

[Text] Yesterday, Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, met a delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran led by Deputy Foreign Minister Va'ezi-Jazai. The delegation is currently visiting Tbilisi.

The conversation touched on the work done by different Iranian specialists in Georgia, the aim of which is to carry out the agreements concluded between Iran and Georgia. The issues of supplying Georgia with oil and gas have also been discussed. At the end of the meeting, both sides said they were interested in eliminating conflicts in the Caucasus in order to create favorable conditions for peaceful and fruitful cooperation.